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PREFACE

The purpose of this study is to determine why Negroes in the United States changed their traditional political allegiance from the Republican party. A correct appraisal of the degree and extent of the change required an inquiry into and an examination of the causes of his tie to the Republican party since the party was first organized. By such an examination and inquiry we are able to see to what the Negro was loyal for over three generations. This dissertation sets also as a part of its objective an evaluation of the factors and forces which played an important role in producing the change which was everywhere manifested in 1940.

Was the change the result of inherent weakness in the policies and programs of the Republican party? Did the change result from serious thought and judgment on the part of the Negro relative to limited participation in the Republican councils? Did the Negro change parties in an effort to raise his status as an American citizen? How far was the Republican indifference and tacit acquiescence with the southern Democrats responsible for the Negroes' change of party politics? How far was the Democratic bid, the deference and considerations shown Negroes recently responsible for wooing the Negro from the
Republican party? Finally did the Negro, as a result of migration to the North, change his traditional belief in the divinity of the Republican label to a belief that men and measures were far more valuable than the labels which the men wore?

The writer's interest in this study was aroused while a graduate student in political science at the University of Illinois, 1932-1933. Some data were collected at that time to prepare a thesis on "The History and Organization of the Republican Party." The subject was changed for several reasons but those data collected were preserved and from time to time others were acquired. The written classroom reports of several of the writer's students at both Langston University and Morgan State College were means of obtaining data which saved the writer considerable time and effort. Every expression in this dissertation has been verified and all claims and contentions supported by evidence.

The newspapers referred to were made available to the writer by their publishers other than The Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Pittsburgh Courier; the latter two were studied at the Library of Congress in Washington, 1943-1944. The writer wishes to thank Miss Olive June Diggs, editor of the Chicago Bee, Mr. C. A. Franklin, editor of the Kansas City Call; Mr. J. H. Singlestacke, editor of the Chicago Defender; Mr. J. E.
Mitchell, editor, The St. Louis Argus; Mr. L. W. Werner of the New York Age; Mr. Carl Murphy, editor, of the Baltimore Afro-American, Reverend C. P. Powell, editor of the Amsterdam News, Mr. Roscoe Dungee of the Black Dispatch; for permitting him access to their newspaper files.

The members of the staff in libraries of Chicago: the Newberry, the John Crerar, the Chicago Public, especially the George Cleveland Hall Branch, the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, and the library of Loyola University have generally been generous in help and patience. To all of these the writer expresses his sincere thanks.

A debt of gratitude is owed to members of the Faculty of history in the Graduate School of Loyola University, Chicago, which is greater than the writer can repay. They saved him from many errors in both facts and judgments. Their excellent guidance, their seemingly unlimited wisdom, their endless patience and above all, the goodness of their hearts were a constant challenge to all that was noble in the writer. It is rare to find so many people connected with one university with such wise heads and such good hearts.

Finally the patience, the sacrifice and encouragement of my wife, Ola Mae Tatum, was a contributing factor in this study. Her unselfishness added to her other qualities gave the writer
inspiration, renewed determination and resolution to continue
the study. Without her and the consolation found in her devo-
tion the study might not have been completed.

Whatever imperfections, weaknesses, and limitations this
work contains are the author's alone. Since the errors are
neither known nor willed the author finds some consolation in
the expression of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. "Every year,
if not every day, we have to wager our salvation upon some
prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge." Thus the writer says
with Chaucer's Squire,

"Hold me excused, if I say ought amiss,
My aim is good, and lo, my tale is this."
CHAPTER I

THE POLITICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE NEGRO IN THE UNITED STATES

1. Introduction

The attitude one possesses in approaching this problem is exceedingly important. Anyone who approaches this subject with a fixed opinion about the Negro, whether favorable or unfavorable, is likely to find himself confusing what the truth is with what he wants the truth to be. It is obvious how such a mentality would prevent an objective and scientific analysis of the data, thereby rendering the production not a work of science. One of the first requirements of a scientist is the possession of a correct mental set—a mind open to truths whether bitter or sweet.

It is not the objective of this dissertation to rewrite the history of the Negro in the United States; such has been brilliantly done by several persons.¹ The objective of this

study is to see whether the political thought of the Negro in 1915 was basically the same in 1940. If this question is important, its importance lies to a considerable extent in the answer to two questions. First, what role did the Negro play prior to 1915? And secondly, does it make any difference to the whole nation what this thinking has been in the period under consideration—1915-1940? The answer to the first of these questions involves considerations of the influences and forces which were acting upon them prior to 1915 since it is a well established fact that patterns of behavior are not isolated, complete entities in themselves, but are dependent and coordinated. The answer to the second question involves an analysis of our concept of majority rule, for if their thought and consequently their action makes no difference in the political affairs of our country, then we are not governed democratically but dictatorially. But to admit that we are governed in a democratic way is to admit that the political thought of ten per centum of the population is important.

The reader's attention is called to the limited nature of this study, limited by time to a twenty-five year period, and limited in scope to one aspect of their history, namely, their political thought.

son, The Negro in Our History, The Associated Publishers, Washington, D. C., are a few of the better known works.
The political role which the Negro has played, either directly or indirectly, is older than the nation itself. Notwithstanding the claims of several writers of history that Negroes first came to America in 1619 as slaves, an increasing number of historians show by use of documents that the Negroes came to the new world much earlier than 1619 and at least some of them were not slaves. Woodson believes that Pedro Alonso Nina, a pilot of one of Columbus' ships was a Negro and declares:

In the discovery of the Pacific Ocean Balboa carried with him thirty Negroes including Nuflo de Olana. In the conquest of Mexico Cortez was accompanied by a Negro. Negroes assisted in the conquest of Guatemala, and the conquest of Chile, Peru, and Venezuela. Negroes accompanied De Aliyon in 1526 in his expedition from the Florida peninsula northward and figured in the settlement of San Miguel near what is now Jamestown, Virginia. They accompanied Marvez in his ill-fated expedition in 1527 and continued with Cabeza de Vaca, his successor, through what is now the northern part of the United States. They went with Alarcon and Coronado in the conquest of Mexico.

The above citation puts Negroes among the earliest explorers of this continent and nothing in the citation indicates their condition was different from the condition of others. It


is the belief of some recent writers that the twenty Negroes who landed at Jamestown were bound out as indentured servants.\textsuperscript{4} An enactment of the Virginia legislature in 1661 lends support to the proposition when it declared that Negroes "were incapable of making satisfaction by addition of time for their loss in running away."\textsuperscript{5} Why "addition of time" if Negroes were already slaves? This fact is revealing because it shows Negroes were bound out for limited duration prior to 1661 and that lawmakers were required to enact measures to protect those who had contracted for their services. The reports of the committee of the Council of Burgesses contain extensive discussions by its members over the question of slavery.\textsuperscript{6} The number of laws enacted in an effort to regulate every aspect of slavery gives some notion of the political significance of the subject.\textsuperscript{7}

In the early years of American colonial history white indentured servants were sufficient for the labor demands. For that cause Negro slavery was for many years stagnant, or it grew.


\textsuperscript{5}William Waller Herring, \textit{Statutes at Large}, A Collection of Laws of Virginia from the First Session of its legislature in 1619, Richmond, 1819, II, 26.

\textsuperscript{6}W.O. Blake, \textit{The Political History of Slavery in the United States}, Columbus, Ohio, 1857, 369-379. (Compiled from source material, published and sold exclusively by subscription. Hereafter, Blake's \textit{Political History}.)

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., 370-388.
quite slowly. However, in 1688 England ceased to export indentured servants, thereby creating an instant need for more Negro slaves. Accordingly, the number increased from an estimated 58,850 in 1715 to 501,000 in 1775.\(^8\) When the first census was taken by the United States in 1790 there were 757,000 slaves in the country in a total population of 3,929,214.\(^9\) Due in part to increased demands for more slaves from Africa and the West Indies, several states of Europe fitted out ships with which large numbers of slaves were brought to our shores. By 1800 there were 893,041 slaves in the North American colonies.\(^10\)

The political importance of the slave is not contingent upon their number alone. In fact their political importance lies more in their quality than in quantity, for if they were sub-human beings incapable of civilization morally, a number of slaves was no different from any other number of valuable things which their owners possessed, such as animals or farm implements. But, to admit slaves were human beings with minds capable of development was admittance of a degree of actual or potential political importance not associated with animals. Human beings in a democratic process must be counted to determine the number

\(^8\)Ibid., 378-388.


\(^10\)Blake, Political History, 430.
of seats in the assemblies, how justice is to be administered, and the method of regulating the civil, political, and economic policies of the nation. Indeed, the effort to fix status upon the Negro and slave brought forth some heated discussions in every colonial assembly after 1621.\textsuperscript{11}

The discussions centered around such questions as: whether the slave should be regarded as person or property; whether manumission should follow conversion; whether slaves could own land; may free Negroes own slaves; who determined the status of the offspring; what is the relation between master and slave; what should the penalty be for intermarriage; what is the status of children when one parent is colored and the other white, or one free and the other slave?

Prior to 1662, slavery was not hereditary; it was in this year, however, that Virginia initiated such a system; and all of the colonies thereafter followed suit; Maryland, 1663; Massachusetts, 1698; Connecticut and New Jersey, 1704; Pennsylvania and New York, 1706; South Carolina, 1712; Rhode Island, 1728; and North Carolina, 1741.\textsuperscript{12}

The above facts tend to emphasize the significance of the Negro in the deliberation of the legislative bodies. More laws

\textsuperscript{11} Richard Hildreth, Despotism in America, An Inquiry into the Slaveholding System, John J. Jewett and Company, Cleveland, Ohio, 1854, 71-72. (Hereafter Hildreth's Despotism.)

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 177-219.
were enacted which dealt with the Negro during colonial times than any one subject; everything from hereditary slavery to prohibition of slavery was discussed at length.13

One would be led too far afield from the immediate undertaking if he followed the argument supporting and denouncing the system through all the colonial assemblies even though they were interesting and informative. It is sufficient for the purpose here to note that there were able men on both sides who kept the issue of slavery alive, some going so far as to invoke the sacred Scriptures to lend support to their claims.

2. Importance during Revolutionary Period

The emphasis upon freedom, liberty, and independence during the Revolutionary War and the fact of Negroes' participation in that war were among the causes for much discussion in the post-war period. The disposition of territories belonging to the colonies recently confederated as partially independent states became a subject of solicitude in the states and Congress. By the terms of their charters some of the states had an indefinite extension westward, only limited by the power of the grantor. Some of the charters conflicted with each other, where the same territory was included within the limits of two or more totally distinct colonies. That situation created many problems when

13 Blake, Political History, 380-383.
the expenses of war began to bear heavily upon the resources of some of the states. Those without territory in the West felt that their advantages in the expected triumph would be less than those states with western lands.

Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia laid claims to vast dominions beyond their boundaries, while New Hampshire (save in the section now making the state of Vermont), Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, and South Carolina possessed no such dominions with which to meet the war debts. The latter urged, with obvious justice, a surrender of those unequal advantages to the federal government, that is, all the lands within the territorial limits but outside of the natural boundaries of the several states. That land, under the suggestion of the "landless states" was to be held by Congress, in trust for the common benefit of all the states and the proceeds therefrom to be employed in satisfying the debts and liabilities of the confederation. This suggestion was ultimately responded to with reservations: Virginia reserved a sufficiency beyond the Ohio to furnish bounties promised to her revolutionary officers and soldiers, Connecticut demanded a western reserve simply because her charter provided for it; Massachusetts required five million acres in New York to be reserved as Massachusetts Territory because her colonial charter
provided for it.14

The cessions were made after the close of the Revolutionary War. One of the duties imposed upon the Continental Congress which held its session in Philadelphia was the framing of an act or ordinance for the government of the vast dominion which had been committed to its care and disposal. Congress placed the duty of disposing the territory in the hands of a committee consisting of Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, chairman, S. Chase of Maryland and Mr. Howell of Rhode Island. In due time the committee reported a plan of government of the western territory which embraced several of the slave states. This plan contemplated the division of the territory into seventeen states, eight below the parallel of the Falls of the Ohio and nine above it. Among other rules reported by the Jefferson Committee were the following:

After the year 1800 of the Christian era, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said states, otherwise than in punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been convicted to be personally guilty.15

As soon as the report was finished Mr. Spaight of North Carolina made a motion to strike out the paragraph dealing with slavery,


and Mr. Read of South Carolina seconded the motion. Mr. Howell of the House asked for a vote upon the motion which he put as follows: "Shall the words moved to be struck out stand?" The question was lost, the words were struck out altogether, six states voted "aye" while three voted "nay"; fifteen members voted for it and six against Jefferson's proposition. Under the terms of the Articles of Confederation, nine states were required to carry a proposition: since this requirement was not met, the comprehensive exclusion of slavery from the federal territory was defeated. The ordinance, after undergoing several amendments was approved, all delegates but those from the South voting in the affirmative.

In 1787 while the last Continental Congress was sitting in New York, simultaneously with the convention at Philadelphia which framed the Federal Constitution, the question of the government of the territory was again taken up. A bill was submitted by the chairman, Nathan Dane, of Massachusetts, which embodied many of the provisions originally drafted and reported by the Jefferson Committee with modifications. There were six articles of perpetual compact in the bill, the last of them as follows: "There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory otherwise than in punishment of crime

16 Ibid., 152.
whereof the parties shall be duly convicted. This law prohibited slavery in the northwest territory which contained a larger area than the slave states of the South. The biggest question in considering the western land loomed around slavery.

One does not need an unusual mentality to be able to see how Negroes as slaves played a politically important role in our colonial history. The deliberation, discussions, and enactment centering around them when the Ordinance of 1784 and that of 1787 were under consideration lend emphasis to the point. Those who led the discussions might have been motivated by economic and religious considerations; nevertheless, it required political manipulations and strategy to get their points over. The inescapable deduction is that the slave was politically significant or else the lawmakers unwisely employed their best talent for a considerable portion of the time.

3. The Constitutional Convention

In 1787, the convention of delegates from the several states was legally assembled at Philadelphia to revise the articles of Confederation. The result of their labors was the formation of a constitution for the United States. Eleven states sent fifty-five of their most illustrious citizens—men highly distinguished for talents, character, practical knowledge

17 Ibid., 156.
and public service. Eighteen of those members were at the same
time delegates to the Continental Congress, and there were only
twelve who had not sat at some time in that body.\textsuperscript{18} One of the
first major problems to be settled was the rule of apportion-
ment. What should be the number of representatives in the first
branch of the legislature? Ought the number from each state to
be fixed or increase with the increase of population? Ought
population alone be the basis of apportionment, or should
property be taken into account? Those were some of the questions
to be answered before much could be done to establish a more
perfect union.

It is plain that whatever rule might be adopted, no apportion-
ment founded upon population could be made until an enumera-
tion of the inhabitants was taken. The number of representa-
tives was at first fixed at sixty-five, but in establishing a
rule for future apportionment great diversity of opinion was
expressed.

In 1787, slavery existed in every state other than Massa-
chusetts; however, the great mass of slaves were in the southern
states. The southern states insisted on representation accord-
ing to number, bond and free, while the northern states insisted
on representation according to the number of free persons only.

\textsuperscript{18} W. Hickey, editor, State Paper, Public Documents, and Other
Sources of Political and Statistical Information, T.K. and
Each point was forcibly urged by able representatives. For example, Mr. Patterson of New Jersey regarded slaves only as property, and pointed out they were not represented in the states, why should they be in the general government? "They are not allowed to vote, why should they be represented?" James Wilson of Pennsylvania asked, "Are they admitted as citizens? Why not on equality with citizens? Are they admitted as property, then why is not other property admitted into the computation?" 19

Members of the convention from both sections of the union who saw that neither extremes could be carried, responded to the suggestion of the aged Franklin to compromise by counting the whole number of free citizens and three-fifths of all others. Before the vote could be taken on the report, a proviso was moved and agreed to that direct taxes should be in proportion to representation. Subsequently a proposition was moved to count three-fifths of the slaves in estimating taxes and making taxation the basis of representation. The latter proposition was discussed pro and con relative to its merits. The discussions finally revived opposition to the apportionment of representatives according to the three-fifth ratio.

Some of the best statesmen severely denounced slavery; for examples, Mr. King of Massachusetts declared that he could never

19 Blake, Political History, 394.
agree to let them (slaves) be imported without limitation, and be represented in legislature. "Either slaves should not be represented or exports should be taxable." Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania pronounced slavery as "a nefarious institution. It is the curse of heaven on the states where it prevailed."

Mr. Mason of Virginia declared,

Slavery discourages arts and manufacture. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the immigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. 20

The comments of a few who defended slavery should also be mentioned, for they show how keen was the clash of opinions over the question:

Mr. Ellsworth of Connecticut said:

Let every state import what it pleases. The morality or wisdom of slavery is a consideration belonging to the states. What enriches a part enriches the whole and the states are the best judges of their particular interests. 21

Mr. C. Pinckney of South Carolina said, "South Carolina can never receive the plan if it prohibits the slave trade" (referring to the three-fifths ratio). 22 Delegates from South Carolina and Georgia repeated the declaration that if the slave

---


21 Ibid., 442.

22 Ibid., 443.
trade were prohibited, their states would not adopt the constitution. General Gerry of Massachusetts thought the convention had nothing to do with the conduct of the states as to slavery, but declared "they should be careful not to give any sanction to it." 23

In the debates as reported by James Madison, the Negro and the slavery question were constantly brought before the convention. Slavery was a national institution and there were friends and foes to the institution in all sections of the country. Anyone who reads the proceedings and debates cannot escape the impression that Negroes, both slave and free, were an item of unusual political importance.

4. The Constitution

The references in the Constitution to the Negro, directly or indirectly, slaves or freemen tend to emphasize their political importance. Among its provisions which refer especially to the Negro or to the subject of slavery are the following:

Preamble:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility ... promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty ...
Article I, Section 2:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within the union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons.

Section 9:

The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax or duty may be imposed, not exceeding ten dollars on each person.

Article IV, Section 2:

The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges of citizens in the several states.

No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered upon claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.

One notices the absence of the words "slave" or "slavery" in the document. Mr. Madison, who was a leading and observant member of the convention, and who took notes of its daily proceedings, affirms that this silence was designed--the convention
being unwilling for the Constitution to recognize property in human beings.\textsuperscript{24} In passages where slaves are presumed to be contemplated, they are uniformly designated as "persons" never as property. In a state supposedly based upon Christian principles the fathers of the Constitution were ashamed to allow the world to know that such an institution as slavery had their sanction. Surely some of the constitutional fathers were proud of their phenomenal achievements but there were an increasing number who believed the achievement to be of temporary duration. One of the reasons for the belief was the question of slavery.\textsuperscript{25}

Time devoted to discussing slavery and slaves in the Constitutional Convention and the amount of space given to the subject in the instrument itself are indicative of the political importance of the slave.

5. The Period 1877-1865

From the time the Constitution was framed in 1787, to the time Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation for 1863, no subject received more attention from the lawmakers and the administrations than slavery. The judiciary of both state and federal governments at times were called upon to decide contro-

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., 469. "The reason of duty are without basis as slaves are not like merchandise, consumed, etc.," was his argument.

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., 130-136. See Luther Martin's discussion on national government and sovereignty of states.
versial issues in regard to certain aspects of the subjects. The major political considerations centered around the following: prohibition of slavery; slavery in new states; fugitive slave laws; circulation of anti-slavery publications in the mails; the Webster, Clay, Benton versus Buchanan and Talmadge debates; the annexation of Texas; the Compromise of 1850; the Kansas-Nebraska Bill; Congressional proceedings about the affairs in Kansas; and the Dred Scott Case. Fortunately for the writer, such topics have received excellent treatment at the hands of many experts which appear in a number of general and special works.

The welfare of the United States, apart from any danger from without and more especially the welfare of the slave states


called ever louder for executive, legislative, and judicial interference. Sensible to the evil of slavery, an increasing number of people opposed it on the principles of equality and justice. In proportion as the anti-slavery forces increased in the legislatures of the free states and Congress, those tribunals evinced systems of a steady, firm, and settled determination to uproot the slave system. Some of the southern anti-slavery men gathered sufficient courage to confess to themselves and to others the wrongfulness of the system.\textsuperscript{28}

Through the medium of Congress the anti-slavery sentiment of the North was brought into active cooperation with the anti-slavery sentiment of the South. Not until northern representatives of non-slaveholding constituencies could stand on the floors of Congress and boldly speak their minds upon the subject and be heard, could much be done about the abolition of slavery.

It was following that manifestation of courage the technical legality behind which slavery entrenched itself began to be questioned, not only by the politicians, but also by churchmen and members of civic organizations. There was a growing number of people who admitted the institution of slavery had for its

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{M. S. Evans, Black and White in the Southern States}, Longmans, Green, and Company, London, 1915, 46-47.
sanction enactments and practices of colonial times. By 1861 usage as a policy was totally incapable of furnishing a satisfactory foundation for any claim of right. In this connection it is well to remember when the colonies set forth in the Declaration of Independence the natural rights of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, they pledged themselves to the world and to each other to recognize and maintain those rights. By 1861, many of the nation's foremost political leaders were asserting the natural rights philosophy and strongly believed the abolition of slavery was a debt due from the country and from the memory of the Revolutionary fathers under its principle and the principles of democracy and human nature itself.

The time finally came when the ascendancy of democratic ideas were firmly established in the North and the domination of the aristocratic clique was completely put down. New organization took form dedicated to the prevention of slavery. New political leaders grew more articulate in denouncing the system. Books began to roll off the press the purpose of which was to crystallize sentiment against slavery; liberal editorials ap-


peared in newspapers denouncing the slave system; some ministers preached sermons against slavery while Negroes themselves sang and prayed for deliverance. These efforts of the legislators, the publishers, the pulpit, and the slaves took form in a new political party, the Republican.

While the Republican party was in control of the national government the first and only great internal military conflict within this country took place—the Civil War. This war resulted at least in part from consideration of the question of slavery. When one reflects upon the way slavery affected the privileged and aristocratic classes, and further upon its influence upon the concept of equality and justice, it becomes increasingly plain why slavery not only threatened to dissolve the union, but required upon the battlefield the blood of several thousands of the best young men in both North and South before it was abolished. It was a terrible fight, skill versus skill, genius versus genius, and theory versus theory. The southerners fought for local self-government and the right to enslave and govern other men; the northerners fought for universal self-government and the institution which had made such things possible.

# The morale of the anti-slavery supporters was given a boost by the uncompromising denunciation of the slave system by Pope Gregory XVI in 1846. His stand, though far reaching and important, does not form a part of the subject matter of this dissertation.

## The principles and platforms of this party will receive attention in Chapter III of this dissertation.
sible without injustice to other men.

The fathers of our nation set for themselves political democracy as a goal. The people were thought of as the foundation of society. The word, "people," included all of them. Thomas Jefferson had well expressed the American creed when in 1784 he said,

Every government degenerates when trusted to the ruler of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, are its only safe depositories. . . The influence over government must be shared among all the people. If every individual participates in the ultimate authority, the government will be saved. 31

6. Emancipation and Reconstruction

In September, 1862, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation declaring all slaves held in the southern confederacy would be declared free on January 1, 1863, if the rebellious states had not returned to the union by the latter date. The conditions demanded by the Proclamation were not met by the rebellious states, and as a result, the slaves were declared emancipated. In 1865, the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution reinforced the Emancipation Proclamation, thereby giving Lincoln's war measure the highest form of American legality.

One of the questions instantly to attract attention of the administration centered around protecting the freedmen in their

31 Notes on Virginia, 1784, 207.
freedom. Men in many walks of life showed a willingness to help—philanthropists, ministers, teachers, and politicians. A large number of educational institutions were established and consecrated teachers struggled untiringly to raise the mental status of the former slaves.32

Everywhere it seems many people were in an attitude to remove the dangers and uncertainties inherent the situation. They were not long in realizing if the freedom which had been conferred on the former slaves were worth the price paid for it, Negroes themselves should be put in a position to protect it. It was in consequence of such a conviction the Fourteenth Amendment was enacted, which among other things declared,

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, or deny to any person the equal protection of the law.33

It is hard to imagine anything needed for the protection of the freedmen not covered by this amendment. It tore asunder the


33 Article XIV, Section 1.
dicta of Justice Taney in the Dred Scott Decision. In contrast to Justice Taney's declaration that Negroes were "citizens neither of the states nor of the federal government," they were by the Fourteenth Amendment affirmed to be citizens of both.

Although the Fourteenth Amendment was thought to be airtight, flawless in its composition and sufficient in every way to give protection to the freedmen, it was found to be defective. The great defect in it was in its tacit recognition of the right of a state to disfranchise the ex-slaves should a state so elect. It is true, a state could not disfranchise without sacrificing some of its representation in Congress, but if they were willing to make the sacrifice, there was nothing in the amendment to prevent discrimination.

It was to remedy such defect, so palpable and so dissonant from the concepts of the founders of our country, so contrary to the doctrine of human rights, so repugnant to the principles of Christianity, and so much in conflict with the general theories of equality of mankind that another amendment was enacted—the Fifteenth. This amendment, furthermore, was designed to rescue the freedmen from the uncontrolled domination of the late slave-masters who were determined to prevent the freedmen from fully
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enjoying their newly-acquired liberty.\textsuperscript{35} It was designed, furthermore, to put into the hands of the freedmen a weapon for their own defense. The measure was strongly opposed by the Democrats of the South who used every device at their command to defeat it, while the Republicans marshalled their energy to pass it. The amendment, after several modifications in both House and Senate was carried, February 25, 1869, by the necessary two-third vote, and the proposed amendment was submitted to the legislatures of the states. The Fifteenth Amendment reads, Section I,

\begin{quote}
The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be abridged by the United States, or by any state, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
\end{quote}

Section 2,

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The Amendment received the affirmative vote of twenty-nine states, the necessary three-fourths and on March 30, 1870, President Grant communicated the fact to Congress in a special message. Among the things the President said in his special message, two sentences are of special value in this dissertation:

\textsuperscript{35}If one entertains any doubt about the determination of the southern former slave-masters to prevent the freedmen from enjoying the provisions of the fourteenth and fifteenth Amendments, he needs only to read the debates in Congress on those amendments. The \textit{Congressional Globe}, Thirty-eighth Congress, Volume XXXV, Part I, 683-694. Also Henry Wilson, \textit{R. and F. Slave Power}, 414-454, 647-683.
I call the attention, therefore, of the newly enfranchised race to the importance of their striving in every honorable manner to make themselves worthy of their new privilege. To a race more favored heretofore by our laws I would say, withhold no legal privilege or advancement to the new citizens.  

With the help of "carpet baggers" and "scalawags" and the United States army, Negroes were soon in control of the legislatures of several of the southern states and had several members in the national Congress, and the city councils. This resulted from the disfranchisement of many whites for having engaged in a war against the union.

The story of the methods employed by the whites to reverse the situation is very well-known; it involved and included intimidations by such organizations as: The Pale Faces of Tennessee, the Constitutional Guard and the White Brotherhood of North Carolina, the Knights of the White Camellia in Louisiana and Arkansas, the Council of Safety in South Carolina, the Men of Justice in Alabama, the Society of the White Rose, the Seventy-six Association, and the Robinson Family in Mississippi, the Knights of the Rising Sun and the Sons of Washington in Texas.

36 Wilson, R. and F. Slave Power, 682.
The most determined, best organized and largest of the organizations whose purpose was to circumvent the provisions of the Fifteenth Amendment was the Ku Klux Klan. It is thought to have been organized in Tennessee in 1866. Although it might have been a social organization when first organized, it soon became at least in part political. It resorted to whippings and murder of Negroes if their ghost-like dress and gruesome voices while usually sitting on sheet-covered horses at night did not prevent Negroes from going to the polls.

Reverend A. S. Larkin, a minister of the Methodist Church was sent by the Bishop of Ohio to northern Alabama to study the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. He reported that in the four years, 1868-1871, there were thirty-two murders and three hundred and forty-one whippings in that section alone. Movements or organizations as those mentioned above greatly deterred the Negro in his efforts to make use of the guarantees in the Fifteenth Amendment. Liberty is precious, but, without life, it is meaningless to people.

From 1870-1877 the whites had a chance to experience the folly of committing the governments into the hands of people in-

39 Wilson, R. and F. Slave Power, 630-646. The activities of that organization became so widespread that Congress appointed a Joint Committee to investigate it. After ten months, April, 1871 to February 9, 1872, the Committee issued a voluminous report in twelve volumes which covered most of the states.

40 Ibid., 642.
capable of running it efficiently, due to lack of training and experience. In consequence of this lack of experience on the part of the Negro, the whites of the South became more determined not only to recapture the control of the governments but to obtain for it legal sanction when they acquired control. The law was to be so manipulated that Negroes would be barred from future political participation. The early schemes employed are well known to students of history and consequently need no discussion here. It is necessary however, to mention them to keep the thought intact. There was inserted in the constitutions of the several southern states "grandfather clauses" or requirements to pay poll taxes for two years prior to election and show receipt for same, or to pass educational tests at the time the ballot was requested. Those devices or requirements in no way violate the letter of the Fifteenth Amendment, but the application of those devices violated the spirit of the amendment.

It was impossible for the Negro to vote in some states because the polling judges and officials in charge of the election applied the law rigidly to Negroes but ignored the law in case of whites. Intimidation, propaganda, insertions in state constitutions of illegal provisions which were enforced against Negroes by the turn of the twentieth century, practically completed the disfranchisement of Negroes in the South.
The disfranchisement was sided by the rise of a new Negro leader, Booker T. Washington, who taught that the best way for the Negro to enjoy full citizenship lay in economic possession and acquiring an industrial education; not in the ballot and political activities. Washington's philosophy was vigorously opposed by the young, brilliant W. E. B. DuBois, who insisted that the Negro should use, possess, and enjoy every privilege accorded to citizens under the Constitution.

Both of these men—DuBois and Washington—were soon regarded by Negroes and whites as leaders of a type. Their failure to see eye to eye on how to develop the Negro into a full-fledged American citizen tended to bewilder the Negro. In consequence of this lack of agreement there developed three distinct schools of thought relative to the attitude and policies which should be employed by Negroes in order that their best interest would be served.

First, the ultra-radical or revolutionary school. Members of this school may be characterized by a high degree of nervous tension and by impatience with the old Negro leaders; an insistence upon aggressive action; and a revolt against any and every form of racial oppression. Negroes, they say, must follow the

42 DuBois, Black Reconstruction, 139-190.
movements for economic and political betterment, such as those followed by other successful minority groups. Some of the members of this group are: A. Philip Randolph, organizer of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Paul Robeson, the versatile artist in music and drama; James Ford, the Communist candidate for vice-president of the United States, 1936; and Chandler Owen, co-organizer of a radical magazine, The Messenger.

The editors of The Messenger were as much opposed to DuBois Booker T. Washington, and Moton as they were to Cole Blease and Vardaman. They repudiated the Republican party and condemned the Christian church. An editorial appearing on Thanksgiving Day, 1936, declared,

We do not thank God for anything... Our Deity is the toiling masses of the world and the things for which we thank are their achievement. 43

The thesis which the ultra-radicals attempt to support is that since the Negro as a group is unskilled, deprived of political rights and exploited in various ways, he should identify himself with organizations and movements which do not compromise with justice. 44

Ultra-radicalism appealed to only a small number of Negroes because, first; its philosophy ran counter to the Negroes.


44 Ibid., 326.
orthodox religious traditions, and secondly; social equality failed to function in practice as in theory. A few things should be mentioned which gave the ultra-radicals a tremendous appealing force: The Scottsboro Case of Alabama where nine Negro youths had been condemned to death when they had not been proven guilty, and the failure of Congress to enact constructive legislation for the Negro. The ultra-radicals agitated unceasingly for justice in the case. The agitation heightened their prestige with Negroes.

Secondly, the conservative or Booker T. Washington school. The members of this school believe in making the best out of a bad situation. The Negro was taught to accept race prejudice, but to increase his economic status by industrial education and land-ownership until there was an increasing demand for him and what he developed and produced. The thesis of this group was that the Negro could acquire full-fledged citizenship more readily by economic development than by political activities. This philosophy is still popular with some Negroes but has been repudiated by others. The latter group seems to be increasing.

Thirdly, the liberal group. Its members urge the Negro to wage an unceasing and uncompromising fight for the enjoyment of the full rights of American citizenship as guaranteed by the

Constitution. They insist upon identical rights and privileges in all social and political policies and practices; and encourage aggressive actions in an effort to attain the requirements of citizenship in fact, as opposed to citizenship in theory. The foremost leader of this school was W. E. B. DuBois who was editor of the Crisis for over twenty-five years. The columns of this magazine were used to dispense his philosophy.

The above facts show that shortly after the turn of this century the Negro was without any unified leadership upon which it could rely for wholesome advice and guidance. The philosophies championed by former leaders were in conflict with each other in regard to the best techniques and methods to be followed. Should the policy be one of active aggression or passive resistance? Should there be, first, insistence upon the practice of democracy and the guarantees of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments or should the Negro first strive to prove worthy of those guarantees? Many books and articles were written shortly before and during the first decade of the twen-

tieth century in an effort to settle the question of priority. Such problems led some Negroes to seek for a solution in the courts, state and federal. The grandfather's clause was challenged and found to be without legality. Success in this instance led to the belief in the United States Supreme Court as protector of their citizenship, and motivated Negroes to challenge other southern laws and practices.

Southerners, apprehensive of the Negro's increasing numbers and intelligence sought to accomplish their objective--isolation of Negroes from the political life of the South--by regulating membership in political parties and the close primary. Party qualification were set up which made it impossible for Negroes to meet them. An effort was made to make the primary election a private affair, hence open to only persons

47 According to W. E. B. DuBois, Black Reconstruction, the following are among the authors who believed Negroes to be subhuman and congenitally unfit for citizenship and suffrage: John W. Burgess, Reconstruction and the Constitution, 1866-1876; E.M. Coulter, Civil War and Reconstruction in Kentucky; W.W. Davis, The Civil War and Reconstruction in Florida; John Porter, The Early Days of Reconstruction in South Carolina; J.R. Ficklin, History of Reconstruction in Louisiana. Every writer here listed who completed a history of reconstruction of a southern state is styled an "Anti-Negro," 731.


whom the members of the party selected. The obvious purpose was to exclude the Negro from the Democratic party in the primary election. If this policy was not in violation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution, the election of public officials would be a private affair, reasoned a brilliant young Texas dentist. Accordingly, he went into court in 1927, to see if the Democratic party in Texas was public or private and secondly, to determine whether the Texas statute of 1923 which declared "in no event shall a Negro be eligible to participate in a Democratic party primary election..." was not a denial of his right as a citizen.\(^5\) The state of Texas lost the case because Texas had attempted to achieve its objective by statute. She was quick to see how the objective could be accomplished by another method.

The Texas legislature then passed another statute authorizing the state executive committee of any political party to determine who may vote in its primary. The Democratic state committee promptly passed a rule excluding Negroes from the Democratic primary of 1928. The militant Nixon after presenting himself for membership in the Democratic party and thereafter sought to vote in the primary, was denied the privilege. He sued Mr. Conson, chairman of the state Democratic Committee. The case was lost in the courts of the state but was finally

taken to the United States Supreme Court. In 1932, the United States Supreme Court again ruled against Texas. Since 1932 the legislature has repealed its statute governing the matter. Still determined, however, the state Democratic Convention in 1932 adopted a resolution declaring that "all white citizens of the state of Texas...shall be eligible to membership in the Democratic party and as such entitled to participation in its deliberation." In the case of Grovey v. Townsend, the United States Supreme Court upheld the contention of Texas. The court took the position that a resolution was not the denial of any constitutional right under the Fourteenth Amendment and the exclusion thereunder did not result from a state law or the act of any state official.

Although the Negro was effectually barred from participating in the Texas primary by the dicta in Grovey v. Townsend, another case involving the Texas primary, L. E. Smith v. S. E. Allwright and J. J. Luizza, was taken to the United States Supreme Court. The court rendered its decision on November 10, 1943; but since no one represented Texas, a re-hearing was set for January, 1944; April 3, 1944 the court by 8-1 ruled in:

53 295 United States 45, 1935.
favor of Dr. L. E. Smith. 54

There has been very harmful effects of the exclusion of the Negro from his political rights in the South. The policy creates a sense of injustice in his mind. Taxation without representation was as unjust from 1900-1940 as it was in 1776. Conferences of Negroes have constantly and repeatedly protested against the southern policy of disfranchisement. The call of the Fourth Session of the National Race Conference declared:

The right to vote and be voted for is the first of rights. It is the vital principle of self-government and individual liberty. The ballot makes the difference between the citizen and the serf. Without the ballot the colored American is powerless to contend for right and justice and civil equality; with the ballot he is all powerful to act in defense of every lawful privilege. 55

What will be the Negro's next move falls into the realm of speculation and does not form any part of history. The challenge in the Supreme Court of many novel events such as equalization of teachers' salaries; admission to the universities of the several states; and the legality of city residential ordinances, etc., imply the fight for the guarantees in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments are not over.

A book of considerable size could be written in an effort


to show how the Negro has proven worthy or failed to prove worthy of first class citizenship. On the negative side of the book could be listed his illiteracy, his crime record, his poverty, his poor health, and his lack of civic pride and several other deficiencies. On the positive side could be noted his achievement in the fine arts, in science, in athletics, his commercial and industrial institutions, the lengthening of his life span, his participation in the wars, his loyalty to the flag and his response to social and civic demands.\footnote{For a record of the Negro's achievements, consult the volumes of Munroe N. Work, \textit{Negro Yearbook}, 1911-1940; and Florence Murray, \textit{Negro Handbook}, 1940-1945. For a discussion of those who deny his proven worthiness, see the list given by W. E. B. DuBois, \textit{Black Reconstruction}, 731.}

The situation confronting the Negro, that is, discrimination against him as poor and ignorant, discrimination because of color and racial origin, the "understanding" and "grandfather clauses" in Constitutions of the southern states, and the "white primary" have tended since 1890 to keep the better class of Negroes in the South from voting. With the shift of large numbers of Negroes from the South to the North since 1915, there has been a tendency toward toleration and liberalism in the South. Negroes, too, have shown an increasing consciousness of the value of unlimited political participation.

Prior to 1915, the Negroes' thinking was done under the pressure and conflicts to which they were subject. It had very
little connection with political problems, but after entering the northern industrial world, their next step was to enter into political affairs. In commenting upon the Negro in the South, W. E. B. DuBois expressed the belief that "there is not another group of twelve million people in the midst of a modern culture who has been so widely inhibited and mentally confined" as the American Negro.57

The South has paid a high price for its Negro disfranchisement by promoting illiteracy. White southerners in general believe that by keeping the Negro illiterate they are at the same time limiting his participation in politics. In that way the southern whites assume for themselves both the deference and the spoils. They don't seem to have learned that a large number of illiterates, even though they are without political power, cannot be an asset to a democratic state. Wherever there has been a two party system, there has been effort to woo the minority group into the fold of one of the parties. With only one political party in the South political issues become local in scope. This results in the lack of political interest on the part of most of the whites in national and often in state elections. For example, first, the South was forced to accept prohibition before the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment in order to deprive the Negro of his liquor--thus voting dry while

57 Black Reconstruction, 703.
thinking wet. Secondly, the South was exposed to such cruel characters as Tillman, Blease, Vardaman, Heflin, Talmadge, and Huey Long, who, by playing on the prejudice of ignorant voters, were able to ride into office, thereby sacrificing the honor of the people of their states.

So long as the Negro remained in the South where such mentalities wielded the controlling influence, he had to remain politically inactive. The exodus from the South since 1915, is therefore, of primary importance in understanding his changed political thought.
CHAPTER II

THE POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GREAT MIGRATION
OF NEGROES TO THE NORTH FROM 1916-1940

The history of the world affords many examples of people migrating from one place to another: the movement of the Gaels, the Jutes, the Saxons, and the Angles into what is now England; the Slavs, the Turks and the Arabians into southeastern Europe; the Romans into the territory which is present-day Spain and southern France, and the Ostrogoths and Visigoths as well as many other tribes of people into those regions now called Central and Western Europe.¹ It is a truism that whenever people migrate, they seek something which is not readily accessible to them in their environment, or they believe that their ambitions and needs can be more easily satisfied somewhere else.

The migration of Negroes in large numbers from the South to the North within the United States, beginning with accelerated speed in 1916, follows the general pattern of other migrating and immigrating peoples in other parts of the world both in remote and in recent years. Many of the migrating Negroes had

been led to believe that many of the things which were difficult if not impossible for them to attain in the South could be acquired in the North with little or not any effort. That was thought to be true in the political as well as the economic sphere; hence, any attempt to account for the Negro's migration on any single basis is not only a waste of effort but the conclusion based upon such research would be faulty and unwarranted. There were many motives for the Negro's migration ranging all the way from a disrupted love affair to the hope of satisfying a political ambition. This study is restricted to the effects upon the Negro which resulted from large numbers for if only small numbers had migrated the political effects would have been minimized. How did their migration to the North affect their political thought and political behavior? Motive for the migration is only significant insofar as it has political bearing. The fact cannot be too strongly emphasized that no effort is made here to rewrite the history of the great Negro exodus from the South 1916-1940, for the migration is already well written and highly documented. Here our interest in the exodus is circumscribed by its political significance alone.

It has been ably asserted, and is probably true, that the economic motive caused a greater number to migrate than any other single motive. Indeed there are those who believe that if...
the economic motive were not the only motive, it was the primary one. To argue motives would achieve little in this undertaking, for whatever it was, the undeniable fact is that the Negro population in the northern states was greatly increased during the period 1916-1940. Indeed, the Literary Digest declared, "The Black Belt is growing broader in northern cities—in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Pittsburgh." After the declaration, the editor asked the meaning of those population shifts and brought to bear excerpts from a number of newspapers in an effort to give meaning to the Negro's migration. Quoting from the Asheville, North Carolina Citizen, he said, "The population shifts are of the greatest potential importance," and then he gave certain valuable census statistics to prove his point. Thus:

out of a total Negro population of 11,891,143 the census shows that 9,361,577 are still in the South, an increase for the decade of 5 per cent; while 2,409,219 are in the North, an increase for the decade of 63.6 per cent. The West now has 120,347 Negroes or 53.1 per cent more than in 1920. During the ten-year period 1920-1930 the Negro population of the West and North increased by 978,666 as com-

pared with the increase in the South of 449,346.  

After having shown what the increases were in the Negro population in the North and West, he attempted to account partially for the increases by saying, "At least three quarters of a million Negroes migrated from the South during this decade 1920-1930."

During that decade three southern states: Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia showed an actual loss in Negro population while several northern states showed very large increases; for example, Michigan, 182 percent; New York, 108 per cent; Illinois, 80 percent; New Jersey, 78 percent; Ohio, 66.1 percent; and Pennsylvania, 51.5 percent.

It is well to be aware of the limitations of intellectual analysis as a way of truth. In any attempt to explain causal relations one cannot proceed without posting certain values as being more significant than others. Causation can be explained only by selecting certain factors being more meaningful than others. The consequences of this logical dilemma are graphically shown in a familiar anecdote: A student who has just had three or four cocktails is shaving when his roommate slams the

4George F. Havell, publisher, New York City, Volume 110, August 29, 1931, 4.

door. He drops his razor and cuts his toe; he then carelessly ties up the wound and goes to the theater. His toe becomes inflamed, and he finally dies. What is the cause of his death?

The following causes, among others, may be assigned by various persons: General Septicemia, by the doctor; a streptococcus infection, by the bacteriologist; there was no one to take proper care of him, by the mother; lack of discipline in the boy's upbringing, by the uncle; the boy's neglect of the wound, by a timid, methodical friend; the cocktails, by a prohibitionist.

Thus it is with any logical analysis of the great migration of Negroes to the North 1916-1940. One can discover some of the causes, of some of the Negroes' migration from some of the places, but there was no one cause which covers all of the cases. The emphasis which one places upon any given motive may depend upon the person discussing the migration.

Even though the great bulk of Negroes were still in the South, the facts stated above represented far-reaching changes, for they show that almost two-thirds of the entire increase in the Negro population in the decade 1920-1930 occurred in the North.

A careful and scholarly study shows that in the single year ending September 1, 1923, more than 478,700 Negroes migrated from thirteen southern states for the North and West.
Commissioner Phil H. Brown of the Department of Labor reached that conclusion by utilizing data supplied to him by state, municipal and civic statisticians and officials. He worked out a table which indicated the colored population of each of the thirteen southern states, the number of colored migrants, the proportion that those formed to the colored population and the proportion that each state furnished to the total migration for that year. Although the number of Negroes who left the south cannot be established with certainty, since no official record was made, we are able to get a fairly authentic notion of the increase by comparing the numbers in 1910 with those in 1920 in certain northern cities. In an article in Current History Magazine by E. D. Walrond, there is given an account of these increases in thirty-three strategic cities in the North. He found that the per cent increased from a low of 11.9 in Denver, Colorado, to a high of 786.5 in Akron, Ohio. In two cities the Negro population increased over 200 percent—Toledo and Youngstown, Ohio; one had an increase of 307 per cent—Cleveland, Ohio; and one had an increase of 623.4 per cent—Detroit, Michigan. In an article in the New Republic, July 18,


1923, under the title of "The Negro Comes North," Mr. Wairond pointed out many of the reasons for the Negro's northward migration. His language will admit of improvement in neither clarity nor coherence.

Statistics show that in four months the increase in Negro migration jumped from 850—the normal influx—to 12,000 in a single month (1923). The Chicago stockyards advertised for 50,000 Negro laborers. Charting the Illinois Central for transportation, the Negro dropped hoe and shovel, hastily answered the call. That event marked the real beginning of the 1916-1918 migration. It swept from Chicago to Detroit, the colored population of which city was increased over four hundred per cent... For weeks the Chicago Defender, a Negro weekly, carried across the top of its front page in bold-face type the magic sign, "Come up North. Why Stay down South?"

A careful analysis of the quotation above will show it to be neither correct in all details nor general in application, but a more correct, and a more generally accepted description of what was taking place has not been made.

There were two waves or periods of accelerated migration: the first, 1916-1918, when over 450,000 Negroes went North, the other in 1923, when, as indicated above, over 478,700 went North in that single year. After 1919 there was a sharp decline and the migration did not revive until 1922. There was also a

---

period of stagnation in Negro migration to the North in 1924.9

The periods of stagnation in migration do not mean that the
migration was small but that it was not as great as in some
other period. The "pull" in the North—the land of opportunity
where financial, educational, social, and political status could
be obtained—contrasted with the "push" of the South—with its
segregation, social ostracism, poor pay, and the absence of edu-
cational opportunities or justice in the courts—led many
Negroes to go North.

A careful study of the table which Commissioner Phil H.
Brown worked out shows most conclusively that the states in
which there were usually found most racial intolerance and where
mob violence occurred most frequently were the states from which
the highest per cent of Negroes migrated 1921-1923; to wit:
Alabama, 18.8 per cent; Georgia, 25.2 per cent; Florida, 18.8
per cent; and Mississippi, 17.3 per cent.10 Those four states
contributed 79.1 per cent of the Negro migration to the North in
1923 and in the two years 1921-1922, there were more Negroes
lynched in those four states than in the other nine combined.11

In light of those facts, what a prominent Negro physician

9Labor Review, Volume 18, 943.

10Monthly Labor Review, Volume 13, 762.

11The Nation editorial, "The Lawless Nation," Vol. 129, No.3344,
August 17, 1929, 134. See also The Chicago Bee, The Chicago
gives as his reason for leaving the state of Mississippi becomes increasingly significant:

I left the South not in an effort to make more money than I was making in Meridian, Mississippi, but I left in order that my children might have an opportunity to develop their talents and capacities unhampered and unrestrained by a prejudiced and personality-dwarfing environment. Observation and experience had taught me that the average southern Negro was possessed with an inferiority complex that he would not have had, had he been in a northern environment. For a Negro child to be reared in the South in his early and formative years is to take the chance of stifling his mentality and curbing his ambitions. The way to avoid those possibilities was for me to take them away to a place where the doors of opportunity were open to them or at least not tightly shut simply because they are Negroes.12

More light was thrown on the various causes for migration by analyzing the replies received to a questionnaire sent to 110 persons, all of whom migrated from the South between 1915-1925. Seventy-eight were executed and returned. The analysis shows that the motive for migration depended largely upon the economic and social status of the migrating persons. Out of twenty-one who claimed that they migrated for reasons other than economic, that is, for cultural, social, educational and political, nine were lawyers; seven, physicians; two, dentists; one, teacher;

---

12Letter from Dr. E. E. Howard, August 21, 1945. Incidentally, Dr. Howard is the son of a former member of the Mississippi legislature and the brother of Perry W. Howard who has been the National Republican Committeeman from Mississippi for the last twenty-five years. See Appendix #2.
one, minister; and one who gave no occupation or profession. On the other hand, the fifty-seven who did not list social, cultural, or political reason for their migration but economic, six were barbers; four, waiters; five, butchers; four, Pullman porters; three, auto mechanics; three, tailors; and thirty-nine who listed themselves as common laborers. The number of replies might be too small to base any far-reaching conclusion upon, that has bearing upon a general thesis, yet they were sufficient in variety and scope to indicate that the Negro elite was actuated in its migration by consideration not prevalent among the rank and file of Negroes. To state the conclusion differently, the motive for the migration of Negroes from the South depended upon who they were, economically and culturally—the "upper crust" or the "lower crust" in the Negro hierarchy.

Proved by both psychology and experience, it is no longer a question for debate that a very small number of people do the thinking and shaping of behavior of the masses in every age and race. The Negro is no exception. A casual observation of his political activities in a few northern cities—Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Kansas City, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati—illustrates the point. There were a few so-called "upper crust" Negroes who assumed the leadership of the group

13 For the type of questions asked, see Appendix #1.
14 The Literary Digest, Volume 110, August 29, 1931, 4.
in the North when political choices and decisions had to be made. There are many examples of abuse of such confidence by the Negro leaders and of proven unworthiness; but because there were not better leaders known who would assume this responsibility--civic and political--the Negroes in these cities acquiesced to the suggestions and dictates of such persons.

The question might be asked: Where were the Negroes going and what per cent of skilled workers were included in the number? In 1923, an effort was made to answer scientifically that question. In order to arrive at a conclusion pay roll data were secured from 276 employers of Negro labor in the states of California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Oklahoma. At the time of the study there were 60,421 Negroes employed in those states (April 30, 1923) and of that number 19,474 were interviewed. The number which had gone directly North and West from the South and had obtained

#The term "upper crust" Negro is not restricted to those of education and wealth, but as here used it applies to those whose wisdom and integrity, although known at times to be questionable by the recently migrated Negroes, was accepted nevertheless, as their criteria for action.


employment that year was 4,702, or 23 per cent of those inter-
viewed. 17 It is revealing to note that the number of skilled
laborers who migrated from the South to the North was consider-
ably smaller than the number of unskilled. According to Com-
missioner Phil H. Brown, it was less than 5 per cent. 18 That
situation was due, at least in part, to the fact that skilled
labor in the North was organized, while in the South it was not;
and also to the fact that most of the skilled labor—carpentry,
bricklaying, barbering, mechanical work, tailoring, and black-
smithing—in the South was done by Negroes.

Most of the Negroes who went North had left southern urban
communities, that is, they did not leave at first the rural
areas of the South for the urban communities of the North; but
they left the rural areas of the South for the urban communities
of the South, then from the urban communities of the South to
the urban communities of the North. 19

That fact had a double significance because it affects
both the North and the South in their political and economic
policies.

17 Labor Review, Volume 18, 66.
18 Ibid., 62.
19 The United States Department of Labor, Negro Migration, 1916-
1917; (1919) 19-31. Also United States Bureau of Census,
Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932 (1935) 21-35. A dis-
cussion of the rural-urban movement is given in detail page 15
where it fits more properly into the context.
The Effect of the Negro's Migration Upon the South

In the South the effect was felt first in the economic sphere. There was a shortage of servants in the homes, a shortage of laborers in the factories, on the railroads, and on the farms. The effect showed itself again when the whites in an effort to alter the situation greatly increased wages and, to an extent, changed their traditional relation from lord and serf to one of employer and employee. Even southern organized labor showed signs of tolerance in that certain specialized or skilled Negro workers were admitted to membership. In the urban communities to which Negroes migrated from the rural areas the southern city officials began to improve the sanitary conditions of the sections in which Negroes lived, and in some instances health leagues were organized among them.

There are several examples in which the Chamber of Commerce in different southern cities invited prominent Negroes to attend their meetings from time to time and suggest remedies for the Negroes' grievances in the South and help to check the migration. What was said by one Negro at such a meeting in Birmingham:

21Ibid., 92.
22Ibid., 98-99.
ham, Alabama, is inspirational and thought-provoking. After he stated what the grievances were, and after suggesting a remedy, he declared that the Negroes had become conscious that they were badly treated in the South and that their only alternative seemed to have been for them to leave.

You will not reform and they cannot conform. Since that is the situation, they are using that method (migration) of avoiding the unpleasant and undemocratic practices which you people follow down here.²³

A little later in that speech he pointed out that it was impossible to bring back from the North those who had gone there and were making good, and suggested that meeting could more wisely utilize its time and effort by formulating policies which would hold those who had not gone. During the entire address the audience gave him full attention and he concluded that eloquent address by suggesting that after the policies were formulated they would have to be enforced. He suggested a very simple policy--that the whites must change their attitude toward the Negroes, first, and their treatment, second.

In some places, it seems that an earnest effort was made by a few whites to check the Negro exodus by putting suggestions like those mentioned above into practice. There were several new schools built in some of the states; farmers who had been in

²³Opportunity, Journal of Negro Life, the Official Organ of the National Urban League, the National Urban League, New York, 1923, Vol. III.
debt all their lives not only "paid out" but "cleared" money.

white men were seen standing on the streets and in the roads
talking freely with Negro men, a thing unusual and very rarely
done then, and some Negro and white ministers exchanged pulpits
on a few Sundays in a few places. 24

The Negroes as a group feel that most of the southern
whites are hypocritical, which hypocrisy carries over into their
every act and permeates their entire being; hence they say the
whites of the South are not to be trusted when they speak about

24 Reverend Ross D. Brown tells the following story which he de-
clared to be true, about a Negro man who accompanied his
minister to a white church where the colored minister was to
preach one Sunday. After the sermon an opportunity was given
to those who wished to join the church by the assistant pastor
(white). The Negro got up instantly at the invitation and
presented himself for membership in that church. The assist-
ant pastor thereupon questioned him about his conversion, his
reasons for wanting to join that church, if he could not be
of greater service to God and man were he to affiliate himself
with a colored church, etc. Finally, he suggested to the
colored man that he should go home and earnestly pray over the
matter asking God to direct him in the situation. The colored
man is said to have taken the assistant minister's suggestion;
his went home and prayed over the matter for a week and on the
following Sunday morning returned to the same church prepared
to give answer. When the assistant pastor asked, "John, have
you asked the Lord about the matter? What did He say?" To
the surprise of the audience, John, the colored man, answered
that he had prayed over the matter and God had given an answer
to his prayers. The assistant pastor nervously repeated the
question, "What did the Lord say?" The colored man replied,
"The Lord said to me that if I could get into this church I
could do more than He could," and walked out. Reverend Brown
is author of two popular works among Negroes: first, Watch
By Race Go By, and second, The Afro-American Almanac. He is
quite a forceful speaker and for that reason he is in con-
stant demand to fill pulpits and lecture halls. The incident
above, he declared was one which occurred near Brookhaven,
Mississippi, in July, 1918.
the Negro question, for they have too often used Esau's hand and Jacob's voice. The Negro, apprehensive toward the favorable consideration shown them in the South, questioned the permanency of such treatment and wondered whether or not after the emergency was over a greater intolerance would result than had ever been known. Therefore, in spite of efforts to prevent their northward migration they (Negroes) continued to leave the South in ever-increased numbers. The situation just mentioned led some of the southern states to attempt to regulate migration by enacting laws under the provisions of which out-of-state agents were required to pay fees in order to operate within their borders. Those fees were sufficiently high in places to become prohibitive to those agents—ranging from $1,000 in South Carolina to $5,000 in Mississippi. When the Negroes became aware of those laws, they ceased to gather in cities to meet agents, not only out of consideration of their own safety, but also for the safety of the agents as well. On many occasions both were threatened. Agents were smuggled into some of the communities,


26 Scott's Negro Migration, 101-103.


28 Abram L. Harris, "Negro Migration to the North," Current History Magazine 1924, Vol. XX, 924-25.
however, or the Negroes would meet them in some inconspicuous place and arrange for their transportation. Just how they knew when the "agent" or "pass rider" was coming was a secret that only a few shared. Nevertheless, the "agent" usually secured a substantial number upon his "visits." There were several instances in which the agents were apprehended and were required to pay heavy fines or face jail sentences, but those instances served to advertise to the Negro the opportunities in the North. In most of the trials the agent was represented by Northern lawyers who at times denounced in bitter terms many of the conditions in the South, and Negroes either read what he had said in the papers, heard it in court, or heard it in the houses of the whites where some of them were employed.

The Effects of the Negro Migration Upon the North

There were two basic circumstances which made the Negro look to the North in his political aspirations. First, national power was more concentrated there, for the South then, as now, was quite like a minority group itself—a kind of a problem to the nation and to itself; and secondly, the Negroes had the ballot in the North. Those two circumstances served to remove from the thinking of the politically aspired Negro every prop em-

29 Ibid., 925.

30 Scott's Negro Migration, 35-39.
ployed by the Southerners to prevent him from going North. The first migration of the Negro was not from the South to the North, but from the rural areas to the urban areas. Since 1910 Negroes have moved into urban areas in the South as well as into the industrial North. In 1910, 2,684,797 Negroes, or about 27 per cent, lived in towns and cities (that is, centers of population of 2500 or over); in 1930, 5,193,913, or about 43 per cent lived in towns and cities. That urbanization was in accordance with the general trend of the whole population in the United States. The town and city dwellers for all classes represented 46 per cent of the population in 1910, and 56 per cent in 1930. Thus Negro migration to cities was much swifter during the period 1910-1930, although the Negro was still below the average urbanization of the nation.31 A few more statistics here will lend themselves to clarity. In 1910 the Negroes constituted 1.8 per cent of the population of the North; in 1920, 2.3 per cent; in 1940, 3.6 per cent.32 The Negro population in the North in the decade 1930-1940 increased 15.8 per cent; while in the South it


increased 5.8 per cent; and in the West, 41.8 per cent. There is only one interpretation which can be made from those facts, and that is that the efforts of the South to deter northward Negro migration had been futile. In fact, nearly every southern urban community showed a decrease in its Negro population during that decade similar to the one of the decade 1920-1930 while the proportions in northern cities were increased.

How was their political thought and behavior affected by residence in Northern cities? It is a fact which has been recognized from the time of Plato that political behavior is more pronounced and articulate in cities than in rural areas, or thinly-populated regions. That has been especially true in the United States when the two major political parties have been doubtful about the support they would receive from large groups or interests when it appeared that the contest would be close. When the Negroes penetrated the North in large numbers, their presence not only created the possibility of tightening the election, but one must remember that the Democratic party was stronger in many of the industrial cities in the North than the Republican party was in the southern cities. In addition to these facts the Negro seemed to have been alert in realizing


that his political interest should be first local, and after gaining sufficient experience to cope with local situations, interest himself in state and national political affairs. For this reason, many young men who had attended northern schools, both colleges and universities, when they settled in the northern industrial cities to begin their careers became active in local politics. They aligned themselves with the party in power and became articulate in declaring their best interest could be served by helping to determine "who gets what" in the city, not "who gets what" in the state capital or in the nation's capital. Accordingly in New York City and Boston, both Democratic strongholds, Negroes became active with the local Democratic machines as early as 1917.

In 1925 during the mayoralty campaign of J. J. Walker, the Democratic candidate, that eccentric young man in a speech in Harlem, the area in New York which is largely dominated by Negroes declared, "I won't do a thing for Negroes. Nor will I do anything for Jews or Irishmen. But as mayor of this great city, I will work for the people." Negroes in Harlem regarded that stand as an expression of an equalitarian principle which

37The New York Times, October 8, 1925. Also November 1, 1925.
Negro leaders seemed proud to hear. As a consequence of that speech, along with other considerations shown them, a large number of Negroes went Democratic and have remained Democrats ever since.38 The Democrats gave the Negro good returns for supporting them, not sugar-coated pills in the form of praise for their past loyalties and promises which were never kept, but jobs and deference.39 That was not an entirely new policy, for as early as 1919 Ferdinand Q. Morton was appointed assistant District Attorney through "boss" Charles F. Murphy who had championed the Negro cause in Tammany Hall. The Democrats continued their policy and by 1936 there were several Negroes holding positions of honor and distinction in New York City; for examples, there were one district leader for Tammany Hall, two municipal judges, two aldermen, two assemblymen, one assistant state attorney, three assistant district attorneys, one member of the city Civil Service Commission and a large number of clerks, deputy sheriffs, policemen, secretaries, and teachers.40 The pay roll for Negroes in New York City in that year including teachers exceeding $3,000,000 most of which came by way of Tammany Hall.41

38 Claude McKay, 136.


40 54th Annual Report of Municipal Civil Service Commissioner, Paul R. Kern, President, New York City, 1937, 43-44. More will be said about achievements of the Negro in Chapter IV, THE NEGRO AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

41 Claude McKay, 132.
The question now might be broached, what bearing did the migration have upon the political significance of the Negro? An editorial in the *Cincinnati Post*, June 15, 1917, gives a good answer to such a query. After the editor had given a description of the congested living quarters of the Negroes in that city, which he said could be duplicated in many other cities, he declared that in one ward there were 2,793 Negroes registered whose ages were between 21 and 31 and that that number exceeded the next most thickly populated non-Negro ward by over 600. He continued by saying "those men will be voted in bloc and thereby determine who the mayor, the judges, and other officials of this city will be."  

It was the congestion or concentration of the Negroes that gave the northern politicians most concern, for it made them, the Negroes, a threat to any political party that they opposed, if not in the congressional district or the city, at least, in the ward where they lived. To grasp fully the significance and implications of this fact, one must keep in mind how the states are divided into congressional districts, counties, cities, wards and precincts for administrative and political purposes. When a large number of people are concentrated into any of these areas they may by their union with what was formerly a weak party win the election in such regions. It was imperative there-
core for both parties to initiate programs which would appeal
to the Negro in an effort to conserve his support or obtain it.
Republicans felt that they "carried the Negro around in their
vest pocket," according to the expression of Senator Mark Hanna,
while the Democrats knew that if they were to get the Negro
votes they had to break down the Negro's loyalty to the Republican
party. Democrats worked while Republicans slept as far as
the Negro was concerned.

The Democrat's work was the more effective because of the
characteristics noticeable among newly-arrived Negroes in the
North. Negroes were comparatively innocent in politics; they
knew nothing about strategy or political bargaining; hence it
was inevitable for them to fall prey to the "machine" and the
"ring." Seeing his innocence the "boss" working with the poli-
ticians of the underworld began to exploit Negroes not only out
of their money in the policy and number racket, but also out of
their votes.43

The exploitation of the Negro took several forms: some-
times Negroes were paid to vote for a given candidate; sometimes

---

Caldwell gives an interesting account of the methods and tech-
niques employed to exploit the Negroes out of their money in
those games, but the general body of that information, though
important, has no place in this study other than the fact
that those men who financed the policy game were also the
heaviest contributors to the campaign funds of both parties in
local elections. See also H.F. Gosnell, Negro Politicians, The
University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1935, Chapter IV.
the ballot boxes in the precincts where the Negroes lived in great numbers were stuffed; sometimes certain speakers were employed to misinform Negroes relative to marking their ballots so as to make them "scratch" the ballot; sometimes Negroes were told that a vote for a certain person meant Negroes would be returned to the South and to slavery, or that the political "boss" would take away the jobs which Negroes held, if Negroes supported designated parties or persons. 44

These were not the worst forms of exploiting the politically innocent Negroes in the North. When certain politicians there realized how Negroes in ever increasing numbers were becoming conscious of the value of the ballot and the likelihood of its use presently for the nomination and election of members of their own race, some of the local white office-holders in certain regions were alarmed. 45 Accordingly these local white politicians devised schemes to perpetuate themselves in office. By obtaining aid of their friends who were public office-holders local, and state laws were enacted to change the boundaries of the ward or congressional district so as to divide the voting strength of the Negroes. 46 In some places local politicians seemed to have shared Hitler's philosophy in part at least,

44 The Chicago Defender, November 4, 11, 1924.
46 The Chicago Bee, October 3, 1928.
"divide and destroy." The device they used is called gerrymandering; since 1926 it has been employed in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, New York, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia. Each time it was used it divided the regions where Negroes were most thickly concentrated so as to prevent other Negroes from receiving additional positions by election to public offices.47

An editorial in the Chicago Bee, a Negro weekly, might be instructive and informative here. It declared:

Outside of their prescribed districts, it seems impossible to elect Negroes to public political office. Time was in Chicago and Cook County when colored representatives were elected to the county board and the municipal court bench, positions requiring the candidate to poll a large majority of city-wide votes for election which they did. In recent years candidates for those elective offices have been defeated. In the mixed fourth ward some years ago there was the possibility of electing a colored alderman, the great bigwig colored politicians said, "no, the time isn't ripe yet." The same argument was used when Congressman Martin B. Madden was overdue to be replaced by a colored congressman. When the time was ripe to elect a colored alderman from the fourth ward the politician changed the boundary line with the connivance of Negro politicians, so another elective office was lost to us.48

It is an obvious fact that those newly-arrived Negroes from the South were Republicans in their politics if they had been

47 One may see Municipal Reference Library Notes, the New York Public Library, 1927, 6-9.
left alone. The fact is that they were not left alone, for the democrats readily saw their potential power in a so-called democracy. They, therefore, assumed it as their first responsibility to woo the Negroes from the Republican party. That, the Democrats knew, could best be done by making political concession by putting members of the Negro race in positions of high trust which carried great deference, power, and big pay. In New York the Democrats discovered as early as 1922 that the Negroes were not believing in the divinity of the Republican party when the Negroes of Harlem sent a member of the Democratic party to represent the twenty-first district to Albany. 49

In 1924 there was more evidence that the Democrats were wooing the Negroes from the Republican party when they elected Henry W. Shields, a Negro, to the state legislature on the Democratic ticket. 50 In 1924 the acid test was applied to the Negro's Republican loyalty in New York City. In that year the Democratic organization placed the names of two colored lawyers on their ticket as candidates for the bench in the city courts; the Republican organization did likewise. A study of the returns indicates that the votes for the four Negroes in districts outside Harlem were very close indeed; but in the Harlem pre-


cincts and wards the Democratic candidates received a large plurality and were elected. 51

The Democrats were breaking into the Republican's rank with the Negroes, not only in New York but also in other northern cities. One example will suffice to illustrate the point. In Cleveland, Ohio, in 1926, a Negro man in describing what had taken place there in the political arena to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People declared:

At the state election in 1926 we supported Democrats and the Republicans alike, depending upon their merits, and helped to achieve the defeat of the Republican candidate for governor and lieutenant governor and helped to elect a Democratic sheriff in this county. 52

The following year the Negro again demonstrated his independence of party labels when they placed in the field three Negro candidates for public office: Mr. Fleming, a Republican who was returned to the city hall for the eighth time; Dr. E. J. Gregg, who had the endorsement of the Democratic organization, was elected from the same district along with Mr. Fleming and Claybourne George, who was elected from the fourth district as an independent in politics. 53 Those nominations and campaigns

51 Ibid., November 16, 1922.

52 Cleveland Plain Dealer, November 11, 1926. See also Cleveland News, November 11, 1926.

which resulted in the election of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents doubtless made the politicians in Cleveland aware of the fact that the Negro's vote was a prize worthy of effort, for it was then wedded to no particular party label as was justly assumed formerly.

It can be said in summarizing this chapter that the migration of Negroes from the South to the North in the early years after 1915 required that the Negroes make a series of adjustments. They had not developed as a group the techniques and skills with which to effectively manipulate the political symbols; but because of their concentration in northern industrial centers their political potentialities were readily seen, which potentialities gave them tremendous significance. The Democratic party, because it knew that the Negroes were traditionally Republican, began to seek the Negroes' support in several large cities while the Republican party felt like Mark Hanna had said, "I carry the Negro's vote around in my vest pocket," and was consequently indifferent.

The Democratic party of the North gave the Negroes training in practical politics by permitting them to participate in nominating and electing candidates, by serving as judges at the polling places and in many other ways. It would be a grave mistake for one to assume that the Negroes had not had any political experience. A study of the history of the reconstruc-
tion period would show the contrary to be true. The Negroes began to use that newly-acquired training to nominate and elect members of their race to public office, first to the city halls and later to the state's capital. They were confronted by a variety of problems put in their way by white officeholders who were determined to perpetuate their own political existence. The most prominent device used by the whites was the gerrymander. The Republicans shared in the use of those devices as well as the Democrats; however the evidence tends to indicate that the gerrymander was initiated by the Republicans; for it was they who felt that they had a monopoly on the Negro's loyalty and support. When the Republicans found that such was no longer true it seems that they were all the more determined to reduce the Negro to a nonentity in politics. It was not until the Democrats had wooed large numbers of Negroes into their folds in many cities that the Republicans realized that Negroes were thinking beings, thinking of political advantages as well as other advantages. That situation ushered in a contest between the two major parties the purpose of which was to gain and keep the Negro's support. That contest was most articulate in the presidential campaigns of 1936 and 1940.

Thus the migration to the North by a large number of Negroes from the South had a dual effect; an effect upon the South in that it showed the South how dependent it was on the
Negro economically, and as a consequence, the spirit of tolerance was temporarily awakened; an effect upon the North in that it put into its midst a new factor to be reckoned with in running a democratic state—the Negro. The city or state "boss" and the political "machines" along with the politicians and racketeers all exploited the innocent Negro. That exploitation, although not as articulate now as it has been at certain periods in the past, was carried forward under the WPA and other New Deal agencies in 1936 and 1940.

Although no minority is able to protect itself against any powerful organization such as the city "boss" and the political "machines," constant exposure to them will make one search for means of protection. The Negroes did just that in many instances, for example, the protest movements, such as the March on Washington, the lobbyist, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and similar movements. Thus one can say then that in 1915 at the beginning of the great migration from the South to the North the Negro in the North thought very little about political activities, but in 1940, if one judges by the amount of space devoted to matters political in the Negro newspapers and magazines, they thought more about matters political than any other single matter. The Negro's interests in political affairs since his new achievements in
politics ramify in all directions and touch everything from the precinct in which he lives to the great international congresses and conferences at Teheran, Valta, San Francisco, and Potsdam.
CHAPTER III

THE NEGRO AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY 1865-1932

The founders of the Republican party were motivated in their endeavors by at least three considerations: first, they opposed local sovereignty which John C. Calhoun had ably defended until his death in 1850; secondly, they wanted to control the entire nation; thirdly, they denied that a state had a right to secede from the union. What they were contending for and the program they assigned to themselves involved the question of constitutional interpretation and construction which were to have far-reaching effects on many of the economic, social and political issues with which the nation would be confronted in the immediate future. Other questions were raised by their position and program: Could the slavery issue be dodged? Was the union an end in itself? How should the government respond to the growing forces in the North and West, etc.? It was from such issues and problems that the Civil War arose. Later, many matters which had been in the hands of the states were taken away from them and controlled by the federal government. One of those matters was human slavery which the federal government abolished by the Thirteenth Amendment which had followed the war measure known as the Emancipation Proclamation.
A series of reforms followed the Civil War, some of which strengthened the Republican party in the estimation of the Negro. Frederick Douglass, one of the most influential Negro leaders, declared that he was convinced that the Republican party was the Negroes' friend and merited their support and loyalty. 1 In confirmation of such a belief, some who were influential in the party's chambers expressed a sense of responsibility for carrying out the pledges and policies of the Republican party. 2 Winning the war and abolishing slavery were not all to which the Republican party had pledged itself when it was organized, and, if those who led it were to remain true to their ideals something more would have to be done for those unfortunate freedmen who had been nearly three centuries handicapped by American slavery. Accordingly, when the Republican party was in control in the states as well as in the national government and when most of the southern whites had been dis-

1Frederick Douglass, The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass, Centenary Memorial Subscriber's Edition, Pathway Press, New York City, 1941, Appendix I, 649-650; an oration delivered on the occasion of the unveiling of the Freedman's Monument in memory of Abraham Lincoln, in Washington, D.C., April 4, 1876. (Hereafter referred to as Douglass, Life and Times.)

2Lord Charnwood, Abraham Lincoln, Constable and Company, London, Ltd., 1917, 167. In speaking of Lincoln, Charnwood says "His choice was not the result of merit; on the other hand, it was not the work of the ordinary wirepuller, for what may be called the machine was working for Seward. The choice was made by plain representative Americans who set to themselves this question: 'With what candidate can we beat Douglass?'"
franchised for having participated in the war against the union, other measures were enacted for the protection of the freedmen, among them being the Fourteenth Amendment. By this measure a definition of citizenship was given; the rights and prerogatives of citizens were stipulated; and a restriction placed upon the states forbidding them to deny or abridge those rights. When the language of this amendment is carefully scrutinized in the light of political situations then existing throughout the world, it is hard to see anything left unsaid relative to the rights of citizens at that time. A citizen may participate in the formation of the policies of his government and help in the determination of its officers and offices. However, a new construction was to be placed upon the concept, a construction which would make it possible for the South to prevent the freedmen from exercising the rights which the Fourteenth Amendment was meant to confer. The Republicans, accordingly, made another effort to safeguard the rights which had been given to the freedmen by enacting the Fifteenth Amendment forbidding the denial of the suffrage in any state to citizens on account of race, color, or previous conditions of servitude.

The Fifteenth Amendment was far-reaching in its implication and effects, for by it the constitution was changed from what had been a states' rights document prior to the famous Sanford
versus Scott decision in 1857, to a great charter of liberty. Then Frederick Douglass, one of the most illustrious Negro statesmen, could say of the Republican party for having enacted the amendment, "It is in such humane acts that the glory and grandeur of the Grand Old Party lies." The idealism of the party was known to several important Negroes and to many of their white friends, consequently recruiting new Negroes to the fold was made quite easy. The idealism also served to retain those who were among the organizers of the party. Thus Frederick Douglass could convincingly declare that the Republican party was not only responsible for breaking their bonds but it was also responsible for whatever progress the Negroes had made or would make in the immediate future. "The Republican party is the ship, all else the sea" was one of his favorite expressions.

Since the Civil War, there have been times when the Republican party seemed recreant to its former traditions and those eternal principles of human liberty. Such an observation does not constitute in itself a sufficient reason for the Negro to change his allegiance and loyalty from it and to align himself with some other political party. Prior to 1936 the Democratic party had seldom shown any of the spirit of toleration or much

319 Howard 393.

4Douglass, Life and Times, 650.

5Ibid., 477-91.
of the milk of human kindness in the nation as a whole, relative to the Negro. There were, however, a few isolated instances of a Negro being given a position carrying fairly good pay and a little power and responsibility in a few cities or towns. Neither position nor recognition was given in national affairs. Only the Republicans had done that. The fact is, prior to 1924 no Negro was ever elected a delegate to the National Democratic Convention, and not one had ever been seated as a delegate by that body. One was seated as a substitute in the Democratic Convention in 1924 for a short time. This was the first time a Negro in the United States did so.6

All Negroes have never sanctioned all things done by the Republicans at all times, and neither have the Republicans always been just and upright in their dealings with the Negro. No one can deny, however, that the Negro was regarded as a personality by the Republicans in both the campaigns and the distribution of the spoils of victory, while he was completely neglected by the Democrats. However there were some Negroes then, just as there are some today, who claimed that the methods employed by the Republicans to retain the Negroes' loyalty and support were not conducive to the general uplift and the best interest of the

6National Democratic Convention, Proceedings, 1924, 62.
race. One of the weaknesses of the policies of the Republican party, these claim, is that it made available opportunities for a few party adherents to exploit the entire race instead of serving the best interest of the masses. There were many Negroes who had demonstrated ability and capacity, and who sought to serve the government only to be denied an opportunity because of the Republicans' policies. If the later policy had been followed, they argue, the Republican party would have had greater justification for expecting the loyal support of the Negro in the recent presidential elections (1936, 1940). One finds much said about the abuse and misuse of the Negro in support of their contentions. Some of those complaints occurred during the period of Reconstruction. Thus Honorable Hiram R. Revels, who represented Mississippi in the United States Senate wrote to President Grant:

Since Reconstruction, the masses of my people have been, as it were, enslaved in mind to unprincipled adventurers, who, caring nothing for the country, were willing to stoop to anything, no matter how infamous, to secure power for themselves and perpetuate it. My people are naturally Republicans, but as they grow older in freedom, so do they grow in wisdom. A great portion of them have learned that they

---

7 Joseph D. Bibbs, Letter to the writer, November 7, 1945, "Why I am a Republican," Appendix III. Attorney Bibbs, a Negro, is the grandson of the first governor of Alabama; he is a graduate of the Yale University Law School; was for many years editor of the now unpublished Chicago Whip—a popular Negro weekly newspaper; a member of the Illinois Bar, the Cook County Bar Association and the Chicago Public Library Board.
are being used as tools, and, as in the late elections in Mississippi, not being able to correct the existing evils among themselves, they determined by casting their ballots against those unprincipled adventurers to overthrow them. 8

Another former physician-politician declared "The Republicans got the Negroes' support and then forgot them." 9

After giving full weight and consideration to the claims of the Negroes and when their grievances are set over against the record of the Republican party, Negroes seem to have had little reason, if any, to indict and decry the activities of the Republican party until 1912. Those who were most articulate in making such charges seem to have ignored the fundamental fact: the politically innocent and inexperienced Negroes prior to 1920 had acquired no bargaining methods and techniques in politics, hence what they called an abuse was a common practice of political parties toward an innocent and unorganized minority.

When the Republican party is looked at through the eyes of a social reformer of 1945, it is natural to suppose that it would have made errors and contained some weaknesses and imperfections. Is there not a fallacy in judging the party by present-day demands and services relative to the value of its historical role toward the Negro? Would not more logic be em-


9 Dr. E. E. Howard, Letter, September 11, 1945, Appendix II.
ployed if the programs and policies of the Republican party were compared and contrasted with the programs and policies of other parties then existing? Any unbiased and objective study of the platforms, speeches, and the public utterances of the leaders of the Republican party prior to 1932 would be filled with material indicating the Republican party was one of tolerance and sympathetic policies toward the Negro: This cannot be said of the Democratic party as we shall see in another chapter of this study.

The timely and appropriate question might be asked: What are some of the things which the Republican party has done or sponsored for the Negro? Were they not motivated in most of their efforts by consideration other than Negro uplift? Such a quantity of material has been produced by people representing so many points of view that one can find support of a kind for almost anything he wishes to prove. However certain fundamental programs consistently sponsored by the Republicans tell their own story to any mind unclouded by prejudice or Preconceived notions. One may start with the year 1857, only three years after its organization in 1854 and he will find in Iowa, for example, through the efforts of the party the state convention submitted the question of Negro suffrage to popular vote. Although the measure was lost in Iowa it is significant to learn
that over one-fifth of the voters there supported it.\(^{10}\) According to the evidence the Republicans were supported by the Free Soil party at the time. Again in Massachusetts as early as 1866 two Negroes were elected to the Assembly from the City of Boston: E. G. Walker and Charles L. Mitchell, both on the Republican ticket.\(^{11}\) In 1869 Ebenezer Don Carlos of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, was appointed minister resident and counsel general to Haiti by a Republican president and senate; he was the first Negro appointed by the United States government.\(^{12}\) The above facts are illustrative, at least in part, of the attitude and policy of the Republican party toward the Negro, an attitude which it seems was one of genuine tolerance and uplift.

Added significance is given the situation discussed above when those facts are set over against the attitude and policy of the rival party during the same period 1865-1932. It would probably aid in gaining a true perspective were one to keep in mind the fact that whatever policies initiated in the South relative to the Negro resulted from the Democratic party. It was the Democrats who were in power in the South most of the time. The Republicans were in control for only seven years, 1870-1877.


\(^{12}\) Ibid., 193.
Throughout the period in which the Democratic party dominated the political thought and behavior of the South, one notices the southern states not only refused to accept any degree of tolerance toward the Negro but at one time they defiantly rejected the federal constitution. \(^{13}\) The situation in both the White House and Congress was tense after weeks of debate over the matter, so tense as to bring forth a joint appeal by both president and Congress for the voters to decide by election the method of admitting those states to the union. \(^{14}\) The decision reached was: the rebellious states were to ratify the Fifteenth Amendment. Despite this, those southern states defied the congressional mandate for, when their legislatures met each state selected a different date to act on the Amendment. \(^{15}\)

The purpose of the Fifteenth Amendment, which was for the general uplift of the Negro is a fact that no one can deny, hence any effort to reject this Amendment can only be construed as an effort to deny Negroes the benefits which it carried. Thus while the Republicans were endeavoring to increase the political status of the Negro the Democrats were endeavoring to decrease it, or at most, to preserve the status quo. Their

\(^{13}\) Political Science Quarterly, edited by Faculty of Political Science, Columbia College, New York, 1894, Volume IX, 680-686.


\(^{15}\) H. N. Work, The Negro Yearbook, 1922, 175.
efforts, attitude and position have been clearly stated by one of America's foremost historians:

Most of the states presented in one way or another the reasons for their actions. Objection was made to the constitutional amendment when ten southern states were unrepresented in Congress, and also the menace of a reduced representation, but the most formidable obstacle to ratification lay in the so-called penal section which disfranchised from holding office the political leaders of the South. The southern people, it was said, were asked to be instruments of their disfavor by fastening a stigma upon men who had their sympathy and whom they had followed with pride. The Amendment is "an insulting outrage," declared the Governor of Mississippi. "It is a denial of equal rights of many of our worthiest citizens." 16

This quotation from a careful historian reveals the policy of the Democratic party to have been almost anything but democratic. As pointed out above, the attitude may be contrasted with the attitude and policy of the Republican party. This was accepting Negro delegates in the National Conventions, using them in different ways in the national campaigns, electing them to national offices, and appointing some of them to national offices of power, responsibility, deference, and influence... The record of the Republican party is replete with examples of its efforts to uplift the Negro. However, there were a few Republicans who had much to say about the soundness of the Negro's

preparation for use of the elective franchise.\textsuperscript{17} It would probably be illustrative and informative to mention briefly some of the considerations which the Republicans had shown and were showing the Negro.

As early as 1868 there were Negro delegates in the Republican convention, James Harris of North Carolina and P.B.S. Pinchback of Louisiana.\textsuperscript{18} In 1872, several other states sent Negro delegates to the National Convention. Included among the delegates were: A.J. Ransier and Robert Small of South Carolina; S.K. Bruce and J.R. Lynch of Mississippi; William H. Grey of Arkansas; William H. Gibson and J. T. Walls of Florida.\textsuperscript{19} In subsequent conventions, there were James T. Rapier and S. P. Turner of Alabama;\textsuperscript{20} M. W. Gibbs of Arkansas;\textsuperscript{21} C. M. Wilder and E. H. Deas of South Carolina;\textsuperscript{22} John C. Dancy, H. P. Cheatham, J. E. O'Hara and G. C. Scurlock of North Carolina;\textsuperscript{23} J. G. Napier of Tennessee;\textsuperscript{24} C. H. Payne of West Virginia and

\textsuperscript{17}Congressional Globe, 1868, XL, 180 ff.
\textsuperscript{18}Republican National Convention, Proceedings, 1868, 115.
\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., 1872, 184-186.
\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., 1876, 340.
\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., 1884, 340.
\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 64.
\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., 1888, 89-105.
\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., 1896, 104-105.
John M. Langston of Virginia; 25 Judson Lyons and John Long of Florida; 26 Walter Cohen and S. W. Green of Louisiana; 27 and N. W. Cuney of Texas 28 constituting a partial list of Negro delegates in attendance at the Republican Conventions prior to 1900. One searches in vain for a single Negro delegate to any of the Democratic National Conventions at this time (1865-1900). Indeed, there was not only an absence of Negroes, but any white man who suggested reforms in the Democratic party which would make Negro delegates possible was referred to by the opprobrious term "nigger lover" and the reformer's place was likely to be occupied by another white man in subsequent conventions.

The contrast in the attitude and policies of the two major parties was sufficient to drive the Negro to the Republican party and away from the Democratic party had Negroes been inclined toward the Democratic.

As has been indicated, not all Republicans have been tolerant toward the Negro at all times; nor have all of them been sympathetically inclined toward beneficial reforms for them. A study of the contested delegations at some of the Republican conventions removes any doubt of this fact. The contested delega-

25 Ibid., 66.
26 Ibid., 1884, 65.
27 Ibid., 1884, 67.
28 Ibid., 1830, 310.
tions resulted from a split in the control of the Republican party or from the existence of two factions in the party, each of which claims to be the true representatives of the party in its state. One faction, a mixed or "bi"-racial group, is called "Black and Tan"; the other, an all white group, is called "Lily White." Because the whites of the South have been Democratic in their party affiliation since the Civil War, the Republican party in the South has been largely composed of Negroes, and controlled by them. Reflection and observation upon the situation mentioned above gave birth to the idea that a change of its Negro personnel for a white or mixed one would strengthen the Republicans in the South and destroy the one party system there. Many Republicans thought the idea was feasible. In pursuit of such a belief there emerged a group of whites who set as their immediate political objective to obtain control of the Republican machine in the South and subsequently, distribute the patronage. "It was consideration of patronage that led many southern whites to align themselves with the Republican party in the South." 29

The contested delegation in 1912 and the split in the Republican party, one faction of which was led by William Howard

29 Chicago Defender, May 2, 1932, quoting from William L. MacDonald of Fort Worth, Texas. Mr. MacDonald has been for several years the National Committeeman of the Republican party from Texas, and a delegate to several of the National Conventions.
Taft, the other, by Theodore Roosevelt, (called "Bull Moose") did not adversely affect the loyalty of the Negroes to the party's principles. The Negro as a group remained Republican, however some of them supported Taft, while others supported Roosevelt. There is nothing in the election returns indicating the Negro's support of the Democratic candidate. 30

Too much emphasis cannot be put on the fact that Negro delegates at Republican conventions prior to 1916 were from the South. The northern Negroes then were not sufficiently concentrated, nor organized, nor politically alert to have many Negro delegates. Since 1916, however, there have been an increasing number of Negro delegates to the Republican National Convention from the North. This situation was largely the result of the migration of large numbers of Negroes to the North, beginning in that year. (See Chapter II). One finds evidence of the political significance of the migration when in 1916 W. F. Cozart was a delegate to the convention from the Second District of New Jersey, a district which included Atlantic City; 31 in 1924, Dr. G. E. Cannon was delegate-at-large to the National Republican Convention from Jersey City, New

30When the progressive Republicans declared themselves opposed to the renomination of President Taft, and brought about a three-cornered election, the "bull moose" became a very useful symbol as opposed to the elephant of the regular Republicans and the donkey of the Democrats.

Jersey, and in 1923, Dr. W. D. Alexander was delegate-at-large from Orange, New Jersey, along with W. E. Edge. In 1920, there was one Negro delegate to the National Republican Convention from Illinois, Oscar DePriest; in 1924, Illinois sent two Negro delegates, DePriest and Louis B. Anderson, with one alternate, Dan Jackson. In 1928, the Seventy-first District of Ohio sent L. M. Bundy of Cleveland as delegate to the Convention. Thus, one sees many Negroes from northern states in attendance at the Republican Convention after the migration of large numbers of their group to the North.

The data above ought to be sufficient to illustrate to some extent the consideration which the Republicans were giving to the Negro. It was such consideration, at least in part, which caused the Republicans to hold sway over the Negro's political loyalties for over a half century after their emancipation. In addition to permitting the Negro to participate in the conventions and the campaigns, another consideration of the Republicans toward the Negro is worthy of notice since it went far toward tying the Negro to the party.

Whenever the party was victorious in elections, a few

\[32\text{Ibid.}, 1924, 69.\
\[33\text{Ibid.}, 1928, 84.\
\[34\text{Ibid.}, 1920, 43.\
\[35\text{Ibid.}, 1924, 73.\]
Negroes were given conspicuous positions. It would probably be informative and at the same time illustrative to mention the names and positions which some Negroes held at various times:

W. T. Vernon of Kansas and J. C. Napier of Tennessee, Registrar of the Treasury; Frederick Douglass of Maryland and Henry L. Judson of Georgia, Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia; William H. Lewis of Massachusetts, assistant Attorney General of the United States; Ralph W. Tyler of Ohio, Auditor for the Navy Department; Winfield Mckinley, Collector of Customs of the District of Columbia; Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenues, New York City; S. L. Williams, Special Assistant, United States District Attorney at Chicago; Dr. William D. Crum, Collector of the Port at Charleston, South Carolina; Walter Cohen, Collector of the Port at New Orleans; Judson Lyons, Postmaster at Savannah, Georgia, and Booker T. Washington, while not officially holding an appointive position, was nevertheless an advisor to President Theodore Roosevelt. 36

Every one of these appointments were obtained under Republican administrations and every one of them was terminated when a Democratic administration succeeded a Republican one.

The elective offices which Negroes held under Republican administrations constitute an imposing list ranging all the way from the Justice of Peace in some rural backward areas to twenty-

two members of the House of Representatives and two United
states senators. In both appointive and elective offices,
egroes have held places on some of the important committees,
such as the following: (1) Permanent Organization; (2) Cre-
dentials; (3) Rules and Order; (4) Resolutions. Indeed there
was one Negro governor, P. E. S. Pinchback of Louisiana; and
in 1884 John R. Lynch of Mississippi was temporary chairman of
the National Convention. It was reliably reported that had
Lynch's delegation in 1880 and the delegations of other southern
and northern states not yielded in the interest of the party
unity in 1884 S. K. Bruce, an able senator from Mississippi would
have been selected as the party's nominee for vice-president of
the United States, thereby the Negro would have been given a
higher position than he had previously held.

Positions and deference in the Republican party such as we
have previously described led some of the Negroes to think of
being identified with the Republican party as an attainment of
honor, for it was the party of reforms, tolerance, and uplift. An-
other line of thought led Negroes to believe the Democratic
party represented intolerance, disfranchisement, segregation,

37 Samuel Denny Smith, The Negro in Congress, 1870-1901, the Uni-
versity of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina,
1940, 5.

38 Republican National Convention, 1872, 1884, 1896, and 1900

lynching, and everything opposed to their best interest. Hence it was considered a sign of dishonor and backwardness to be identified with that party.\textsuperscript{40} It was said of Negroes who identified themselves with the Democratic party that they endorsed the things done by the southern Democrats and the policies they fostered.\textsuperscript{41} The charge was weighty, since most of the obstructions to their progress, they were told, had been the result of the cunning, conniving and wicked practices of the Democrats. The Negro being unable to analyze or to appreciate the difference between true and false doctrines, accepted much that was false about the political parties. Since the Republicans were first to secure the Negro's confidence and allegiance they were more effective with their false propaganda with Negroes than Democrats.

Another factor of importance in making the Negro Republicans and in sustaining them in the party was the oratory of some of the Negro adherents. Those orators, when speaking to Negro

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 77-79.

\textsuperscript{41} Chicago Bee, May 11, 1932, quoting Robert R. Church, who was the National Republican Committeeman of Tennessee for several years (1924-1940) Oscar DePriest, a former member of the House of Representatives, a delegate to the National Republican Convention for several times from Illinois, a former Alderman and Ward Committeeman in Chicago, made this comment to the writer about Negro Democrats, "There is a melancholy fate awaiting any man who compromises with the devil. To the Negro, devils and Democrats are two names for the same thing." (November 2, 1945.)
audiences, stressed the point that the G. O. P. not only freed them from southern slavery, but the G. O. P. was the party which gave them citizenship, the ballot, public office and other forms of deference. Roscoe Conklin Simmons (reputed to be one of the greatest orators in the United States) in a speech supporting Hoover's candidacy for re-election in 1932 declared:

> If you put a Democrat in the White House, you put the Negro again into virtual slavery. They (Democrats) have neither the brains to run this country nor the sense of decency to be fair and just to you.

A little later (in that speech) he declared:

> I'll say the Republicans built this country; I'll say even more than that: I'll say the Republicans built this country largely upon your shoulders. Now do you want to tear down or be a party to those who will tear down what you have built up through work, blood, tears and prayers? I am sure you hold sacred the suffering of your forefathers who bought this privilege for you by giving their last full measure of devotion for it (voting) and that you will treat it as an hallowed trust. Hoover is the representative of the party and the principles of our forefathers and your best interest.42

Many expressions in the speech may not be historically correct in every detail, but most of the people in a political meeting are not as much concerned about technical history as they are.

---

42 Chicago Defender, October 28, 1932. Also the Chicago Bee, October 25, 1932. Colonel Roscoe Conklin Simmons was a member of the Republican Speaker's Committee in 1932; in 1936 it was he who seconded the nomination of A. M. Landon for the presidency at the Republican convention in Cleveland, Ohio.
about the record, the justification and policies of their candidate and party; and the deficiency and condemnation of the policies and candidate of the rival party. Therefore, such oratory as is frequently employed by Republicans yields a strong influence in keeping the Negro in the Republican party. It is impossible to say which has been most effective—what Negroes saw in the forms of jobs, policies and constructive legislation, or what they heard in terms of praise and compliments of them and the Republicans or condemnation of the Democrats in sustaining them in the Republican camps.

It is a common observation that climax and decline are two different parts of the same action. When the Republican party reached a position in which it could render its maximum service to the causes of Negro uplift, then the forces of disintegration set in. These forces made it appear that the Republicans seemed to have forgotten its earlier policies, pledges, and traditions.

The Negro was a long time in realizing that the Republican party had slipped from some of its traditional democratic moorings and was drifting into the muddy waters of plutocracy. The *New York Age*, a militant Negro weekly, took notice of "that" tendency as early as 1907 and declared editorially:

*The politicians that we have known and with whom we have been in active sympathy...with here and there a discordant note for the past quarter of a century, with the policies they*
have stood for in party management and the conduct of the government, have passed out of active control of Republican politics in the state and in the nation. The Republican party has ceased to be the champion of the American democracy of the 1850's, '60's and '70's. It has become a mere political machine. 43

The editorial contains a long discussion on traditional Republican policies and concluded:

They (the Negroes) cannot do in the future as they have done in the past without wrecking their citizenship. It would be futile to form a race party. It would be folly to go boldly from the Republican to the Democratic party. But if they should give support to one party or another as it shows a disposition to be genuinely democratic, regardless of race in its principles and policies, they (the Negroes) would find the support of their race largely sought for by both parties. 44

Another example of awareness of the Republicans' indifference toward the Negro was demonstrated in 1912 when William Monroe Trotter, editor and publisher of the popular and liberal Boston Guardian, a Negro weekly, called upon Woodrow Wilson, the Democratic candidate for the presidency that year and offered to support him if he would, on being elected, sponsor some legislation favorable to the Negro race and give to the Negro leaders some consideration in distributing the spoils. 45

43 The New York Age, Fred R. Moore Corporation, 230 West 135th Street, New York City, October 23, 1907, 1.
44 Ibid., 2.
This was not the first example of Negroes offering their service to a Democratic candidate as we shall see in the next chapter. This offer by William Monroe Trotter is unique, however, in light of what President Taft in his administration just ending had said. Trotter's bolt of the party implied that if the Republicans were to continue to influence the political behavior of the Negro, they (Republicans) would have to pay a better price for their support than they were then paying, or the Negro would support parties and men who would. Other evidence of the Negro's bolt of the Republican party is noticed in 1912 when the party held its National Convention in Chicago. The Reverend Reverdy C. Ransom, who later became a Bishop in the African Methodist Episcopal Church, took President William Howard Taft to task, charged him with having reversed the policies of President Theodore Roosevelt and all of his Republican predecessors when he (President Taft) initiated a policy of refusing to Negroes positions in a community where the whites did not like such an appointment. He charged the President with insulting the race on two occasions at least; first, when the President remained silent about lynching after his nomination until the beginning of his campaign for election, and secondly, when the President addressed the students and faculty at Wilberforce University and expressed a belief that all education should be
"Jim Crowed." Following those carefully worded charges Reverend Ransom pointed out that an insult was not the worst charge to be filed against the President. A worse charge against him was his failure to keep his promises: for example, he promised to make Mr. J. C. Napier Treasurer of the United States, but instead, tried to appease Mr. Napier and the Negro race by making him Registrar of the Treasury. The position which had been promised to Napier was given to a white man. From the Negro's point of view this was a most damaging charge against the President; for as one prominent Negro politician commented, "it made some of the Negroes believe that Mr. Taft was a wolf dressed in sheep's clothes." Reverend Ransom strengthened his attack on Mr. Taft when he pointed out that Mr. Taft had totally and completely disregarded the interest of the Negro race again when the President indicated his intention of appointing to the Supreme Court Judge Hook, known to be anti-Negro in everything uplifting, as Judge Hook had clearly shown his attitude as co-author of an infamous Jim Crow decision.47 After having heard those charges,


47 The Nation, "Negroes in the Republican Convention," Volume 94, 1912, 696. One finds there an excellent discussion of that convention. This is the only reference that the writer was able to find to Judge Hook or the decision about which Reverend Ransom had so much to say. Because of the paucity of data on either the Judge or the infamous decision, Reverend Ransom's charge here seemed to be without factual support and merit.
a group of politicians referred to as the "Black Cabinet," because they advised the President on matters relative to the negro, went to the President and told him that if he carried out his plan to appoint Judge Hook no Negro of note would speak in his favor in the campaign. 43

Many of the Negro leaders began to accuse the Republicans of turning over the patronage of the South to the whites. This meant that the Negro was no longer being considered as a politically valuable group to be reckoned with by the Republican party. In 1921 a small group of Negroes conceived the idea of interesting far-seeing Democrats in them; and since Woodrow Wilson, they thought, was a new type of politician, he was the man who could effect such an alliance with the northern Democrats. That situation would result in dividing the northern Negro vote and in bringing into the South a real government of the people. Bishop Alexander Waters of the African Methodist Episcopal Church wrote a letter to President Wilson in which the plan was outlined. In reply, President Wilson stated that:

it was his earnest wish to see justice done them (the Negro people) in every matter; and not mere grudging justice, but justice with liberality and cordial good feeling. 49

43 Ibid., 606.
A similar move which grew out of an attitude of indifference by
the Republican party was responsible for large numbers of
negroes voting Democratic in the election of 1912, for there was
nothing in the platform of the Progressive party under the
domination of Theodore Roosevelt to indicate its willingness to
revive the Republican tradition of friendliness and helpfulness
to the Negro. In fact, a group of negroes, including the fore-
most leaders in civic and educational circles, met with Mr.
Roosevelt at the National Progressive Convention and insisted
upon his incorporating in the platform a plank declaring "the
progressive party recognizes that distinction of race or class
in political life has no place in a democracy." This was
turned down. Woodrow Wilson's election followed the split in
the Republican party in 1912, but in 1916, it was thought by
most political observers that the Negro vote went solidly for
Hughes. 51

In the campaign of 1920 the Negro's support went almost
solidly for the Republican candidate, Warren G. Harding. Since
the campaign did not create much excitement among Negroes, it
can be passed over here. It contributed little, if anything,
toward changing their political thought. However, Harding's

50 Ibid., 758.

51 J. C. Van Deusen, The Black Man in White America, Associated
Publishers, Washington, D. C., 1938, Chapter IX.
administration is a different story. He not only failed to ap-
point any Negro to a position of honor and responsibility but
also to give public censor to social and political conditions
of the South in reference to the Negro in his speech of
October 26, 1921 at Birmingham, Alabama. Indeed some Negroes
interpreted his speech as his sanction of the southern racial
policy.52

There were two expressions to which the Negro took excep-
tions: first, "I plead with my own political party to lay
aside any program that looks to lining up the black man as a
mere political adjunct;" and secondly, "There is a fundamental,
eternal and inescapable difference between the Negro and the
white man." Some of the comments of the Negro press speak elo-
quently their attitude about the speech. A few liked part of
the speech, but most of them seemed to like none of it. The
New York News, a Negro weekly, declared:

"None of our Presidents have exhibited such
moral courage in pleading for just treatment
of the Negro, in the section where that quali-
ty has been so severely lacking."53

One's attention is called to the fact that this was a comment
upon the speech as a whole and has no reference to its objec-
tionable features.

52 Chicago Defender, November 3, 1921; The Crisis, December, 1921.
53 George W. Harris, editor, The New York News Publishing Com-
pany, New York, November 3, 1921.
The Baltimore Afro-American, also a Negro weekly, editorially comments:

The President's Birmingham speech is being criticized because it promised the colored race too little, and by the white people because it promised so much.54

The Crisis, a monthly magazine, the Official Organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, editorially declared:

Mr. Harding meant that the American Negro must acknowledge that it was a wrong and a disgrace for Booker T. Washington to dine with President Roosevelt. The answer to this inconceivably dangerous and undemocratic demand must come with the unanimous ring of twelve million voices, enforced by the vote of every American who believes in humanity.55

The New York Crusade, a Negro monthly newspaper declared:

The President's speech supports the worst negrophobist element of the South on at least six vital points: first, the denial of social equality; secondly, the plan of supporting such Negro leaders as will acquiesce in this denial, and in utilizing Negro schools as will further increase the number; thirdly, the claim of inherent Negro inferiority; fourthly, the unwritten southern law that 'black men cannot be white men,' which after elimination of color changes as a recognized impossibility, simply means that black men cannot expect to enjoy all the rights and privileges of American citizenship, enjoyed by white men, citizens and aliens; fifthly,

54 The Afro-American Publishing Company, Baltimore, Maryland, November 2, 1921.

55 The Official Organ of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York City, November 1, 1921.
the South's plan for exclusive industrial education as against any higher education for Negroes; sixthly, the South's noisy opposition to racial amalgamation while silently indulging in its practice.56

The Associated Negro Press through its Department of Public Opinion Bulletin said:

There are two features of the address that have come in for more comment than any of the others. The two are 'Political Equality' and 'Social Equality.'

The discussion of the 'Social Equality' portion of the address has been very exclusive within the group, as well as without. There is a great difference of opinion concerning the advisability of this reference. Dr. Du Bois, Dr. Kelly Miller, as the intellectual group are in the section of those who think social reference in the address was untimely, and yet insist, since the reference is made, there should be no barrier set up by a nation, or individual, seeking to dictate the policy of social selection between individuals.

A little further the release continues:

There has seemed to be no more excitement and alarm, by both races on this phase of the President's address than any other. It is noticeable that the active political group, headed up by K. R. Church, Henry Lincoln Johnson, Perry W. Howard, Walter Cohen and others in the Republican party accept the address as a masterpiece of carefully expressed opinion.57

56 November 2, 1921.

57 See the Chicago Defender, November 3, 1921; the Kansas City Call, The Kansas City Call, Incorporation, Kansas City, Missouri, November 3, 1921.
Those excerpts and comments indicate that shapers of Negro political thought interpreted the president's position at best, to be one of compromise with the South on social and political matters. His position left no good blood in the veins of the Negro for him. Several Negro politicians believe that if Mr. Harding had lived and had been the Republican's nominee for the presidency in 1924 to succeed himself, the Negro would not have given him enthusiastic support.

During the Coolidge regime the Negro had very little against which to register political complaint. The country enjoyed a period of prosperity. The Negro was employed and was making more money in this country than ever before in peace time. There were fewer race riots than in the period 1920-1924, and the number of Negroes lynched had declined. The Negro credited the Republicans and Mr. Coolidge for this and hence felt no reason to revolt. An analysis of the election returns from districts preponderantly Negro indicate that other than a few votes given to Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin in 1924 the Republicans received most of the Negro's support. An examination

58 Opportunity, January, 1922.
60 Negro Yearbook, 1924, 1928, 19 ff.
61 World Almanac, 1925, 724-735.
of the Negro weekly newspapers gives further credence to this belief; nearly all of note supported the Republican candidate, a few were lukewarm toward the progressive nominee, but not one of note for the Democratic nominee.62

The Hoover nomination made after Coolidge's famous expression in the South Dakota Black Hills, "I do not choose to run," was at first given support by the Negro Republican politicians; but when the Democratic nominee of 1928 outlined his program and straightforwardly expressed his policies, Negroes began to increase in number in the latter camp. An examination of the Negro press reveals about as much space was given to Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York as to the California engineer, Herbert C. Hoover.

The office-holding and office-seeking Negro Republicans as usual used their influence for the nomination of Mr. Hoover in the National Republican Convention, and after his nomination they struggled more untiringly for his election. However those who had no political axe to grind, those who remembered the food shortage of World War I, those who questioned Mr. Hoover's eligibility under the qualifying clauses of the constitution,

62 The following ones were consulted: Kansas City Call, June-November, 1924; Baltimore Afro-American, June-November, 1924; Pittsburgh Courier, November, 1924; New York Age, June-November, 1924; Chicago Defender, June-November, 1924; Cleveland Plain Dealer, June-November, 1924; St. Louis Argus, June-November.
since he had been out of the Continental United States for more than fourteen consecutive years, and further, those who could see Governor Alfred E. Smith as one identified with a minority, if not in racial origin at least in religion, felt none too warmly inclined toward Mr. Hoover.

By 1928, Negroes in the United States were more politically alert than ever before. This was due, in part, to his penetration into the North and his participation in politics there. They were taught not only to expect more from politics in terms of deference and responsibility, but, if necessary, to demand more. Accordingly, when Herbert Hoover became the standard-bearer of the Republican party, some of the Negro leaders sent out a barrage of questions to the Chairman of the National Convention and to the several National Committee men of the respective states demanding to know where Mr. Hoover stood on the question of patronage and what was his program for their economic, social and political uplift. It seems that Negroes had firmly resolved not to support blindly a man simply because he happened to wear a Republican label. Mr. Hoover was asked to make his position clear in his acceptance speech. After a committee of prominent Negroes waited on him, Mr. Hoover agreed to

63 Chicago Defender, October 25, 1928, Speech by Commissioner Edward H. Wright.

64 Ibid., July 29, 1928. Also the Pittsburgh Courier, July 22, 1928.
In his acceptance speech, among other things, Mr. Hoover said:

There is one of the ideals of America upon which I wish at this time to lay especial emphasis, for we should constantly test our economic, social, and governmental system by certain ideas that must control them. The founders of our Republic pronounced the revolutionary doctrine that all men are created equal and that all men should have equality before the law.

Mr. Hoover then carefully traced the development of the concept of equality and its application to concrete situations in the United States by declaring:

It was Abraham Lincoln who firmly enunciated this ideal as the equality clause...While the Negro as an American citizen is interested in all of the issues of this campaign, he must of necessity first get freely and fully the equality of opportunity with all other American citizens before he can fully appreciate, participate, and enjoy his full citizenship rights; to attain equality of opportunity will be to remove all other disabilities.

The pronouncement was by far more considerate of the Negro than any which had been made by a Republican presidential candidate since Theodore Roosevelt; however, it was not sufficient to command the united and full support of the Negro. It was not a question of what Mr. Hoover had done or would do as it was the
ids of the Democrats and the personality of their nominee, Governor Alfred E. Smith.

Negroes admired Smith for his courage, his directness, the fact that he was identified with a minority in religion, his record as Governor of the Empire State and the fact that he had risen from lowly origin. Governor Smith was a part of the powerful New York Tammany machine which had shown a spirit of tolerance and uplift toward the Negro on several occasions. Indeed, several years prior to 1928, Tammany Hall had intensively cultivated the Harlem District and had gone out for Negro votes. It had given a number of Negroes unique positions, and built up a reputation among them for keeping its campaign promises. In that campaign Tammany had promised to double the number of positions held by Negroes, which promise led many Negroes to think that were Governor Smith elected president he would continue that liberal policy toward them. Governor Smith was truthful and fearless.

A comparison of the public records of the rival candidates caused some Negroes to ponder whether to support Smith or Hoover. The Negro seemed to have been confronted with a problem similar to that confronting Shakespeare's Hamlet: "To be or not to be," a Republican or a Democrat, was his question in this campaign.

67 The Crisis, October, 1923.
68 The New York Age, September 1, 1928.
Both of the major parties showed much concern about the Negro vote and the best means to employ in order to recruit it and keep it. It was generally thought the contest would be close and it was not unthinkable that the Negro in certain pivotal states might constitute the balance of power. Thus F. R. Kent, a close observer of political trends declared:

The Republicans and Democrats are both worried, and no small part of their worry is caused by the uncertainty regarding the colored brother's vote. Meanwhile the political doctors are frantically prescribing.69

After he had discussed the loyalty of the Negro to the Republican party for over a century, then Mr. Kent showed why the Republicans had just cause for worry at the time.

They won't admit this publicly, but privately, the more candid of the so-called party leaders say that there are certain menacing signs, not lightly to be ignored, that a lot of money and work will be necessary to keep the Negro a permanent cornerstone of the "G.O.P."70

Those illustrations serve only to show the bids for the support of the Negro and the response by the Negro to those offers. Bishop W. T. Vernon, former Registrar of the Treasury as well as having been twice president of Western University, a Negro college in Quindaro, Kansas, said of the campaign, "Hoover had

69 Collier's, 250 Park Avenue, New York, Volume 82, October 20, 1928, 13.
70 Ibid., 14.
Esau's voice while Smith had Jacob's hand, and the Negro was
called upon to decide whether his interests could be best
served by words or deeds."

A careful analysis of the election returns for 1924 and
1926 leads one to the conviction that the Negroes in Harlem
gave Governor Smith a large vote in those years. In the contest
and campaign for the nation's highest honor in 1928 no one
could give a good reason why the Negro then should not support
Governor Smith. Indeed one can find many reasons for expecting
the Negro to support him in preference to Mr. Hoover: first,
Governor Smith was known to favor a repeal of the Prohibition
Amendment and the Negroes were generally in favor of its repeal;
secondly, Governor Smith was an uncompromising foe of the Ku
Klux Klan and the Negroes thought that a vote for him was a vote
against the Klan. Hoover's position on each of the above points
was vague. Thirdly, it was repeatedly pointed out that Mr.
Hoover was giving support to a "Lily White" Republican party in
the South from which Negroes were eliminated and a vote for him
was a sanction of the Democratic party's politics in the South.
More lynching, more segregation, more hard times loomed."

71 See the Kansas City Call, June 6, 1932.

72 The Pittsburgh Courier, Associated Negro Press Release, The
Pittsburgh Courier Publishing Company, Center and Francis
Streets, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 27, 1928.
lic it ceased to be a question of speculation that the Negro, though traditionally a Republican in the South, would become a Democrat in the North. Four years later, 1932, they not only supported Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt in large numbers in preference to President Hoover, but also an increasing number said, "Anybody, but Hoover; or who but Hoover." 73

That campaign and election sent the Negro's political stock sky high, for many careful political observers felt that if Governor Smith would carry the South then he would need the votes of only a few northern states where the Negroes were concentrated to win the election, such as New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Indiana. 74 Because of the strategic position which the Negro had attained in the domestic political affairs of the nation, both of the political parties met promise with promise, concession with concession, bid with bid, and money with money.

The Republicans in an effort to recruit new Negro votes as well as to retain old ones resorted to a trite trick of propaganda. They obtained the services of a prominent Negro physician-politician, Dr. J. R. Hawkins, the Negro who seconded Mr.

73 Collier's, Who but Hoover," Vol. 36, 1932, 12. Attorney L. S. Moore, former assistant Attorney-General of the State of Illinois who was a member of the Roosevelt-for-president-Committee 1932, declared in an interview that Hoover's name had become opprobrious to all the best thinking Negroes before his term was over. In several of the speeches which Attorney Moore made against the election of Hoover, he emphasized the phrase frequently, "Who but Hoover."
Hoover's nomination in Kansas City in 1932. He was put in charge of a division at the Republican National Headquarters and from that position he declared that one of the immediate aims of Mr. Hoover was to break down "Jim Crow" laws in Virginia and throughout the nation.\textsuperscript{75} Anyone with one ounce of intelligence knew this to be untrue.

The Democrats were not slow in the use of propaganda in an effort to recruit new Negro support. One example will suffice to illustrate the point. In Chicago the beautiful Savoy Ballroom was the scene of a gathering of a large number of the nation's most publicized Negroes. The purpose of the meeting was to clarify the issues in the campaign and indicate to the Negroes which of the candidates had their interest most in mind. Attorney Clarence Darrow, who was a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was to speak on the program. He had endeared himself to the Negro by his brilliant defense of Dr. C. H. Sweet, who had slain several whites in Detroit when they had attempted to force him to abandon his home.

The meeting was sponsored by Honorable A. W. Scott, Past Grand Exalted Ruler of the Imperial Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks of the World; Honorable William H. Wallace,

\textsuperscript{74}The Chicago Bee, August 25, 1923; quoting Dr. W. E. B. Dubois.  
\textsuperscript{75}Ibid., November 3, 1923.
High Commissioner of the Universal Negro Improvement Association. The Reverend Noah H. Williams, pastor of the St. Paul African Methodist Episcopal Church of St. Louis; The Reverend S. E. Maloney, pastor, Allen Temple African Methodist Episcopal Church Chicago; Attorney Earl B. Dickerson, a popular brilliant young lawyer of Chicago; and Dr. O. H. Sweet of Detroit. The advertisement of the meeting promised, "free ice cream and music," both magnetic in drawing Negro crowds.

At the meeting Hoover was denounced as a faker, a former Democrat, an opportunist, a tool of Wall Street, a southern sympathizer, an oppressor of minorities and a man without a program. Smith, on the other hand, was extolled to the skies.76 There is no way of determining the number of votes the meeting secured for Governor Smith. The size of the crowd which was very large, as well as the exhibition of enthusiasm would indicate Smith was very popular and this popularity did not suffer as a result of the meeting. The campaign was a hotly contested one. There was bitter personal criticism by each of the opponents. Some campaign managers believe however that such criticism does a candidate more good than harm. A striking illustration is found in the gubernatorial campaign of 1926 when Al Smith made the most of Ogden Mills' charge that he could not be trusted either in public or in private life. In a reply to this accusa-
tion, Smith stated:

Twenty-seven years ago I knelt before the altar and in the presence of God Almighty promised to care for, honor, and protect the woman of my choice. And if I suddenly was ushered tonight before the Great White Throne I would be prepared to establish that I had kept that promise. Let the Congressman lay his private life alongside of mine."

Smith, by that act, seems to have won so much public sympathy that his rival was forced to retract his accusations.

Hoover was an artist in the use of weighted words. The following excerpts, taken almost at random from a collection of his speeches, illustrate the fact:

"We must have emancipation from the creeping collectivism of dictated economy. We must take the government out of business in competition with the citizens. We must have freedom of business, labor and farmers from government dictation. We must grant genuine relief to farmers and restore the farmer's judgment in control of his business. We must have reform in the Labor Act to deal equal justice to all workers and all employers. We must have the only basis of liberalism, that is the rule of law and not of men. We must reform relief under the administration of non-partisan local committees. We must reform the old age pensions to make them just to the workers. We need to adopt real measures which enable people to obtain better housing.

We must advance the whole question of medical

---

attention to the indigent. 78

Consider the phrases: "creeping collectivism," "dictated economy," "government dictation," "equal justice," "rule of law and not of men"—these are weighted words addressed to the emotions. Such oratory usually appeals to Negroes and brings favorable responses. Therefore, partly because of Hoover's oratory, partly because the South revolted against the Democratic party in view of Governor Smith's religion, and partly because Mr. Hoover had emphasized his "Lily White" program, by which he won southern votes, he was elected. The South preferred a western "Lily White" Republican to an eastern, Tammany, Negro-loving Democratic Catholic.

The campaign and election should have taught those who control the political parties one great lesson at least, relative to the Negro's political loyalties; the Negro's vote was not to be responsive in the future only to Republican's symbols; but more to the policies and personalities which offered the greatest returns in terms of deference and security. Since 1923 the Negro has come to regard political party labels as a means of identifying men, and not as determinants of what the party or the man stands for.

Governor Smith's record as chief executive of the Empire

78 Herbert Hoover, "Undermining Representative Government," An address delivered to Joint Republican Organizations, Hartford, Connecticut, October 17, 1938.
state, his mastery of big business there, as well as his lowly origin, impressed Negroes. His refusal to take orders from Boss Murphy was a display of courage and independence of thought. In 1920, he opposed "Tammany" when it wanted to run William Randolph Hearst as senator. In addition to those appealing qualities, he was vigorous in his opposition to the Ku Klux Klan, which avowedly hated Negroes, Catholics, and foreigners. Incidentally, Governor Smith was not the first Roman Catholic to be nominated for the presidency. In 1872, Charles O'Connor of New York was so honored at a rump convention in Louisville, Kentucky following the nomination of Horace Greeley by the regular organization.79

His position in many ways contrasted with that of the Republican nominee who was building a "Lily White" party in the South and promising little or nothing to the Negro. William MacDonald, National Republican Committeeman of Texas summarized the situation in this manner: "Hoover carried the white South, but Smith the Negro."80 This was probably a true observation because the Republicans were charged with being silent when the Reconstruction Governments were overthrown; they did very little

80The Fort Worth Eagle Eye, 511 East 9th Street, Fort Worth, Texas, December 4, 1923.
to prohibit the nightly riding of the Ku Klux Klan and the intimidation, butchery, and slaughter which accompanied the raids; they never raised their voice as an organized political group when the southern states were enacting the poll tax laws and inserting into their respective constitutions "grandfather clauses" and property requirements as a condition of using the elective franchise; when educational clauses were inserted into the constitution of several states and so administered that Negro Phi Beta Kappas and Ph.D.'s could not qualify, the Republicans as a politically organized body said nothing. These charges, although not true in every detail, indicate a break between the Negro and the Republican party. The Republican's default from its early program toward the Negro was observed by some of the southern whites. Consider this expression by the great international scholar, Professor James Wilford Garner:

Nearly twenty years have elapsed since Mississippi adopted a constitution which, in effect, took away from the Negro his political privileges, and although the party which has conferred political rights upon him has been in control of the national government during most of this period, no serious attempt has been made to interfere with the action of the state or to punish it by reducing its representation in Congress as the Fourteenth Amendment declares shall be done. Hardly a sincere and respectable protest against the disfranchisement of the Negro has yet been made by the Republican party and recent events would seem to justify

31Opportunity, October, 1927.
the conclusion that it has virtually abandoned him as far as his political rights are concerned.32

A little later Professor Garner continues by declaring that:

If the white people of the South exercise their power of control wisely and justly, it can be perpetuated to the end of time without protest or interference on the part of the country at large or indeed without serious opposition from the black race itself.33

What was said by such men as Pickens and Garner cannot be lightly taken, for it is unusual for a northern Negro to share the political views of a southern white man, or vice versa, when they are dealing with the question of the race in politics. An examination of the platforms of the Republican party since 1915 shows that the party for several years did not concern itself with anything relative to the Negro (1916-1928). In fact, when the convention met in Chicago on June 8, 1916, no direct reference was made to him.34 In 1920, Warren G. Harding said, "We urge Congress to consider the most effective means to end lynching in this country which continues to be a terrible blot on our American civilization," but since several whites were

33 Ibid., 176.
lynched that year and the previous years, that cannot be said to be a pronouncement relative to the Negro. President Coolidge in 1924 made a similar statement to that of Harding, but he also avoided the use of the term Negro. It was not until 1932 that a definite plank was put in the platform dealing with the Negro as a notable group's welfare, for the 1923 platform was as vague as the others immediately preceding it.

The platform of 1932 declared:

For seventy years the Republican party has been the friend of the American Negro. Vindication of the right of the Negro citizen to enjoy the full benefits of life, liberty and the pursuits of happiness is traditional in the Republican party and our party stands pledged to maintain equal opportunity and rights for our Negro citizens. We do not propose to depart from the tradition nor to alter the spirit or letter of that pledge.

The platforms reflect the indifference of the party toward the Negro in that period. There is much speculation as to the causes for that, but speculation forms no part of history regardless of how interesting. There are, however, two reasons for the Negro's complete reversal of attitude toward the "divinity" of the party; these do not fall in the category of speculation and should, therefore, be pointed out here. First, as we have seen, there was a tendency of the Republican party to

85Ibid., 461.
86Ibid., 571.
forsake or ignore them in the South. This, the Negro thought, was tantamount to endorsing the southern policy of "Lily Whitism" and all of the other nefarious and undemocratic practices.

Secondly, the failure of the party to keep its campaign pledges when it had the temerity to make them. It might be said in summary that from the Civil War until 1932 nearly all of the Negroes were Republicans in politics. They could not have been otherwise, even if they had wanted to, for the Democrats did not want them, generally did nothing for them and would not have them as members of their party. The abandonment by the Republican party of its traditional position, the penetration into the North by a great number of energetic and intelligent Negroes since 1915 and the overtures made to them by the Democrats began to woo the Negro away from the Republican party, so that in 1932 they were somewhat in a doubtful state relative to party labels. The Negro, then, was divided largely along chronological lines. The old Negro was still Republican and emotionally tied to the party, while the young Negro was dynamic and progressive and sought reason in terms of security, positions, and deference as a condition of pledging his support. Thus before 1932 the

---

37 See Appendix III, Joseph D. Bibb, "Why I am a Republican."

38 Appendix IV, Representative E. A. Green, "I am a Republican," November 17, 1945; Attorney Green was for four terms a member of the General Assembly of Illinois on the Republican ticket; a member of the Illinois Bar and Cook County Bar Association.
Negro was a Republican without any modifications, but since 1932, as will be shown in the next chapter, when he is found remaining a Republican, he requires all of the modifications—Independent, Progressive, and Reactionary—that are in existence.

The Negro can thus say with Tennyson,

Not once or twice, in our great Island Story
the path of duty was the path of glory.
CHAPTER IV

THE NEGRO AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, 1932-1940

There is little reason, if any, to doubt that prior to 1932 the American Negroes as a group were generally loyal to the Republican party. The loyalty had its foundation, in part, at least in traditions and sentiments which extended back to the time when that party was organized in 1854. In the early days of the party's history one of the ablest Negro statesmen played at least a minor role and for that cause, if no other one existed, the Negroes thought the Republican party was the one with which they should align themselves.¹ Beginning about the middle of the nineteenth century and continuing without serious interruption until 1932 the political affiliation and political thought of the American Negroes was that of a single party--Republican--which had since that date (1854) consistently held sway over them. Indeed, prior to 1933 there had been little difference of opinion among Negroes over what party to support although there are examples of differences among some of their leaders over what Republican candidate to support. With

¹Frederick Douglass, Life and Times of Frederick Douglass, 358-366. See also The Journal of Negro History, by Carter Woodson, editor, The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1338 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., Volume XXIV, 1941, 413-484.
rare exceptions, they could be counted upon to follow loyally the party label in the congressional caucus, the state and national conventions and in the general election. The distinction between men and measures, issues and "isms" were not clear or were unknown, or they were ignored. In such a situation and setting the Hoover administration found itself in 1929.

The four years during which Mr. Hoover was president, 1929-1933, were in several ways heart-rending to the Negro as well as to the nation at large. The economic crisis which occurred shortly after the beginning of his term not only caused a lot of suffering but it served to render Mr. Hoover increasingly unpopular. There were other occurrences, which will be discussed shortly, some of which can justly be attributed to Mr. Hoover while others were beyond his control. The occurrence which taxed the Negro's continued Republican loyalty as it did other people was one that Mr. Hoover could not control and prevent. This was the depression which struck the country in 1929 and continued throughout his administration. Those who suffered as a consequence of the depression thought that Mr. Hoover was responsible for it. That fact is shown by the frequent references one finds to it as "Hoover's Depression." If the views of certain economists were taken for it, there would be little or no ground for making Mr. Hoover wholly responsible,
for they had many years before propounded a law which claimed that business disturbances, sometimes called crises or depressions, were predictable for they occurred naturally at about seven-year intervals.\(^2\) Under that theory the year 1929 was overdue for a depression, since the previous one had occurred in the fall of 1921.

A discussion in an effort to demonstrate the value of that law has value in the immediate undertaking only insofar as it helps to fix responsibility on Mr. Hoover. If it could be proved, as some people claimed, that Mr. Hoover's grant of a moratorium to the debtor nations caused American businessmen to distrust generally the soundness of his policies and as a consequence would not expand domestically or make foreign investments, then Mr. Hoover was at least partly responsible for it.

But, if on the contrary, depressions are the results of natural forces, even when they are predictable, they may not be controlled by finite man; that should have exonerated Mr. Hoover.

There exists abundance of literature which supports both views, but for the purpose here it is only necessary to know the depression occurred and as a result of it Negroes, like many other

people, left the Republican party in large numbers.³

The intensity of the depression was increased in regard to the Negro because he had recently witnessed the greatest era of prosperity he had ever known in this country. In both the North and the South, many had purchased homes, made investments in life insurance, started small businesses, and in numerous other ways not only invested their savings but pledged their income from whatever source derived to meet those obligations.⁴ Then that depression struck the country it not only destroyed their savings in the banks and their investments, but it robbed them of an opportunity to continue to earn a livelihood by gainful employment, for as is well-known, the Negro is last to be hired and the first to be discharged when depressions or crises occur in the industrial world. It was in part for those reasons they accepted the current slogan that this depression was caused by Mr. Hoover. They were led to believe that if Mr. Hoover were out of the White House, their opportunities would be increased in business and industry. They cast their lot with that group in the campaign of 1932 which had adopted the slogan, "Who but Hoover," not meaning that he was indispensable, but that anyone


was more to be desired than he.5

In order to give the Negro's complaint against Mr. Hoover
and the Republican party proper emphasis, the grievances of the
nation as a whole are here indicated. It is generally acknowledg-
ed that the Negroes suffer from all of the common ailments
which accompany a bad and deficient administration and in addi-
tion inherit others if for no reason other than the fact that
they are Negroes. It was previously indicated that in the
United States there was a disgruntled group which held Mr.
Hoover responsible for most of the economic ills which the
country was experiencing. For example, the laborers claimed
that his policies were responsible not only for their lack of
employment opportunities, but also for the low wage scale in
1930-1932;6 farmers were complaining about the high cost of im-
plements and the low price of farm products.7 Some business men
saw in the enactment of the Grundy-Smoot Tariff law of 1930 a
revival of the most objectionable features of the Payne-Aldrich
Tariff law of 1908;8 the war veterans saw in Mr. Hoover's treat-
ment of those who had participated in the bonus march on the

5Colliers, Volume 36, "Who but Hoover," (editorial) Crowell-

6Literary Digest, Volume III, October 7, 1939, pp. 7-8.

7The Nation, Volume 133, editorial, "Hoover and the Wheat,"
October 21, 1931, 431.

Capitol in July 1932 a heartless dictator wedded only to the extreme conservative doctrine. 9 Mr. Hoover’s threat to veto the Relief Bill which would provide $2,125,000,000 of federal money for the unemployed and needy people caused those who were in need to feel that their suffering was a matter of indifference to him. 10 They received some consolation, however, when on the next day, July 8, the House of Representatives passed the measure by a vote of 225 to 157. 11

The above grievances constitute only a partial list of those that the general public had against Mr. Hoover. But as Mr. Hoover was the standard-bearer of the Republican party any public complaint against his policies was a complaint against his party. It was indicated above that the Negro suffered from all of the above grievances, and in addition, several specific ones. A few of the latter constitute such an important part of this dissertation, since they were important factors in crystallizing thought against him, that a detailed treatment of them is given. The order in which those complaints appear here does not presume the order of their importance. Any arrangement would have some virtues as well as some faults; for


11 Ibid., July 3, 1932.
the complaints were registered in different places by different people at different times often about different things.

On April 24, 1932, William Pickens, one of the most scholarly and one of the most courageous Negroes, assailed the Hoover administration for its labor policy by which Negroes were excluded from the construction work at Boulder Dam. In a speech in Boulder, Colorado, he ridiculed white America for advertising the untruthful charge that "Negroes don't like to work," while at the same time compel Negroes to fight for a job when it is the government that offers it. Dean Pickens' language will admit of no improvement:

Work is the only thing which brought the Negroes to America. White people came seeking fortunes...expecting to exploit somebody. The Negro came only to work.

After Dean Pickens had carefully substantiated that assertion, he continued,

He has worked faithfully for over three hundred years; he has nursed faithfully for three centuries white babies without kidnapping them--if the government could place black and white men in the same war trenches to fight and die in blood and muck supporting one another, that same government could put them on the same peace time job...Either colored workers will be put on this "dam" job or we will fight Herbert Hoover and all his henchmen for the next quarter century. We remembered an insult from Judge Parker for ten years; we will remember the Hoover crowd until they are all dead.12

12 The Chicago Bee, April 24, 1932.
That speech was given prominence by the Negro press. At least five of the leading papers gave a verbatim reproduction of it or commented upon it favorably. Because the press is one of the potent factors in molding public opinion it can be accepted as true that if the Negro's opinion was not then crystallized against Mr. Hoover, that speech went far toward effecting it. They thought that at a time when they needed work most, and when the political party to which they had given unimpeachable loyalty for nearly three-quarters of a century was in power, neither the government nor the party nor any responsible representative of that party should have initiated nor tolerated a policy which was inimical to their best interests.

In the presidential campaign of that year much was written and spoken about the administration's segregation policy; the Boulder Dam incident was frequently cited as an example in proof. One can easily conclude from what has been said that

13 The writer consulted the following: The Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; The Kansas City Call, Kansas City, Missouri; The Chicago Defender, Chicago, Illinois; The Pittsburgh Courier, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; The Baltimore Afro-American, Baltimore, Maryland. The three listed first above contained the full text in their April 24, 1932 issues; while the last two contained excerpts of it on the editorial page in their May 1, 1932 issues.

14 The Pittsburgh Courier, May 1, 1932.

15 The Amsterdam News, October 4, 1932. Also the St. Louis Argus St. Louis Argus Publishing Company, St. Louis, Missouri, October 3, 1932.
the Negro's loyalty to Mr. Hoover and the Republican party suffered from the labor incident at Boulder Dam.

The Parker Case was another cause for the Negro's revolt of Mr. Hoover and his party in the campaign of 1932. A few of the facts in that case might be mentioned here with profit, for it is only by having them fresh in mind that justification or condemnation of the Negroes' changed attitude toward Mr. Hoover and the Republican party can be made. During the early part of April, 1930, President Hoover sent the name of Judge John J. Parker of the United States Circuit Court of North Carolina to the Senate for confirmation as an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. The nomination attracted the attention of the Negro people instantly, because of Judge Parker's expressed views relative to the Negro in 1920. In the same year, according to the Greensboro Daily News of April 19, 1920, he said,

The Republican party of North Carolina has accepted the amendment in the spirit in which it was passed and the Negro has accepted it. I have attended every state convention since 1908 and I have never seen a Negro delegate in any convention that I attended. The Negro as a class does not desire to enter politics. The Republican party of North Carolina does not desire him to do so.

Then followed the statement that stirred the Negro's blood until it virtually boiled.

We recognize the fact that he has not yet reached that stage in his development where he can share the burdens and responsibilities
of government. This being true, and every intelligent man in North Carolina knows it is true, the participation of the Negroes in politics is a source of evil and danger to both races and is not desired by the wise men in either race, or by the Republican party of North Carolina.16

That statement alone might have been ignored or smeared over by the self-seeking Negro politicians, but some of his remarks in the campaign of 1920 were still echoing in their ears. In all of his speeches he announced that he never wanted any Negro to vote for him and that he would be happy if they would vote the Democratic ticket.17

When President Hoover nominated Judge Parker for the United States Supreme Court bench the Negro press and some of the white press were most articulate in condemning the act. William Hard, a white newspaper man described the situation as follows:

First, the presidential campaign managers of 1928 discarded all efforts to please Negroes in favor of efforts to please southern whites.

Second, the existing Republican administration has appointed virtually no Negroes to office.

Third, the Negro division of the National Committee, under John R. Hawkins, has been closing down.

Fourth, John J. Parker of North Carolina, ac-


17 Ibid., 3338.
cused of opposing Negro participation in politics, has been nominated to be a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.18

Mr. Hard agrees with the views generally held by Negroes that the Parker nomination would have been of minor importance if he or Hoover alone had not in previous actions prepared the Negro's mind for protest and revolt. That nomination was the match which set the proverbial dry hay on fire, or the straw which broke the proverbial camel's back.

A few of the press comments here will be not only revealing but helpful in developing the thesis that the nomination of Judge Parker turned many Negroes against Mr. Hoover and the Republican party. (x)

The Boston Chronicle declared:

Mr. Hoover seems to have gone far afield to add insult to injury to the Negro, most loyal supporter of his party. In his zeal to compensate the white South for its recent wholesale entry into Republican ranks, and his endeavor to hold them, the President has stopped at nothing short of contempt toward the Negro wing of the party.19

The Chicago Defender declared:

If ever there was evidence of a president's disregard for opinion and welfare of a great number

18Ibid., 3339.

19Ibid., Quoting, 3339.

(x) Except as otherwise indicated, these comments are found in the Congressional Record, 71 Congress, 2nd Session, Volume 72.
of his constituents, it is being shown in this particular case. 20

The Kansas City Call commented:

A Lincoln lost the senatorship from Illinois for a principle's sake and became president. A Parker sought a governorship by subverting principle and will lose a Supreme Court judgeship. 21

The Black Dispatch commented:

Judge John J. Parker does not think the Negro has reached the stage in his development where he should participate in politics.

Two great minds seem to be running in the same channel. The Negro does not think that Judge Parker has reached the place in his development where he should be allowed to sit on the Supreme Bench. 22

These comments should be sufficient to indicate how widespread the feeling was against Judge Parker and against President Hoover for nominating him. The Judicial Committee of the Senate received thirty-six protests against Judge Parker and only three boosts--one of those three was given by Mr. J. E. Shepard, Negro President of the North Carolina State College for Negroes, Durham, North Carolina. Mr. Shepard has been referred to, frequently, by the opprobrious term as an "Uncle Tom"--one who has no convictions too sacred to surrender if it were ex-

20May 5, 1930, editorial, 1.

21May 4, 1930, editorial.

22May 5, 1930, editorial, 1 and 7.
pedient to do so; another endorsement was given by W. K. Tyson who signed himself as the Secretary of the National Association of Negro Tailors, Designers and Dressmakers; the third was given by Dr. Hubert F. Craft of Monroe, North Carolina. The last endorsement was sent to Senator Overman in the form of a letter and claimed that it carried with it the prayers of the colored people of Monroe, (North Carolina) for the confirmation of Judge Parker. 23 The thirty-six who opposed Judge Parker represented all sections of the country and a variety of organizations, fraternal orders, religious bodies, college clubs, political groups and committees. Thus the National Bar Association of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, composed of over 300 Negro attorneys asked Senator Joseph R. Grundy to vote against, not only the confirmation of Judge Parker, but also to use his influence with his colleagues to that end. 24

Valuable as the above citations were in influencing the Senate's action, the most valuable opposition to Judge Parker's confirmation came from two other groups: organized labor, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The Negroes at that time must have felt somewhat like Patrick Henry must have felt when he stood in St. John's Church on

23 Congressional Record, Senate, Volume 72, Part 8, 71 Congress, 2nd Session, April 29 to May 16, 1930, 8340.
24 Ibid., 8340.
March 22, 1775 and exclaimed:

Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battle alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is the vigilant, the active, the brave.25

Whether one can prove that the Negro shared Henry's feeling is not significant here; the fact is that a powerful group joined in the fight against Judge Parker which aided greatly in securing Judge Parker's defeat. That group was organized labor.

The position that organized labor took deserves more than mere notice here, for at that time there were very few Negro members in that group and Negroes were neither sought nor wanted in it, due in part to the fact that they had on a few occasions in the past been used as strike breakers. Organized labor therefore did not enter the fight on humanitarian grounds not especially because the Negro needed or requested its aid, but it entered the fight for another reason altogether. Just what was that reason?

Mr. Parker, while serving in the United States Circuit Court in North Carolina as its judge had granted an injunction in a labor case which declared, in effect, that the so-called "yellow dog" contract was valid. A "yellow dog" contract was

one under which men were employed on the condition that they
would not join a labor union. Organized labor opposed that in-
junction because it was not only unfair to labor, but because
it gave employers an opportunity to take advantage of job seek-
ers who were in distress, and could force them to surrender
their natural and constitutional rights. William Green, Presi-
dent of the American Federation of Labor, after having written
President Hoover a letter urging withdrawal of Parker's nomina-
tion, pointed out that Negro opposition was politically sig-
nificant due to the fact that their vote in several of the
northern states constituted the balance of power. He then
asserted when that vote is added to the vote of organized labor
many thoughtful senators who are not anxious to lose their
positions will vote to reject Judge Parker. The Negroes,
therefore, had a powerful ally in their fight even though it is
doubtful whether the ally was motivated in its undertakings by
considerations of the Negro's interests.

Just how did the Negro make himself effective in that
undertaking, that is, the fight against the confirmation of
Judge Parker by the Senate? That is a long interesting story
which centers largely around the activities of the National

26The New York Evening Post, D. S. Thackrey, publisher, New
York City, May 4, 1930, 3.
Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (x) A few of those facts lend themselves easily to a chronological arrangement.

First, the NAACP secured some of that Judge's utterances from prominent people and from newspapers while he was campaigning for governor of North Carolina. These expressions, the Negroes said were inimical to them as citizens and showed the dwarfed mentality of the nominee. (The statement was the one mentioned in this chapter, page 131.)

Second, the NAACP sent Judge Parker a telegram relative to the alleged remarks which Judge Parker refused to answer. After having given him ample time to answer the telegram, and after no answer had been received, the NAACP then filed a formal protest with the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. The Senate, although Republican, the party which the Negro had loyally supported and many of whose members were there because of the Negro's support, refused to consider the protest until all others who objected to his appointment had been heard.

Thirdly, the New York office of the NAACP contacted the local branches of the organization throughout the country and advised the local branches to use their influence with the people in the vicinity and have those people flood Washington: the President, representatives and senators with telephone calls,

(x) Hereafter referred to as the NAACP.
letters, telegrams, petitions and personal visits, particularly those from the North and the border states, in an effort to block senatorial confirmation. They were told to remind their governmental representatives of the forthcoming election when their vote might be important. The senators' reaction to the barrage of communication was interesting; some thought that the protest would soon come to an end, while others expressed surprise, still others were bewildered at the Negro stepping out of his traditional role of meekness, still others were alarmed at the extent of the movement and began to wonder about its possible effects upon the next election.27

Fourth, the NAACP asked President Hoover to withdraw the nomination of Judge Parker; in this way, Negro voters would escape the dilemma of either voting against the administration or voting against their best interests as a minority group. Some of the senators made a similar request upon the White House which the White House at first ignored.

Fifth, the one Negro endorsement of Judge Parker was sent to the Judiciary Committee alone with 138 affidavits from prominent Negroes against him (Parker). An investigation by the NAACP shows that some few friends of Judge Parker tried to bribe certain prominent Negroes into making public utterances endorsing Judge Parker and when bribery failed, they were threat-
Sixth, mass meetings were held in certain prominent cities including Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Kansas City, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia, and telegram blanks were provided from which messages were sent to their respective senators. It was said that over two thousand were sent from Chicago to the senators from Illinois on the Sunday before the senate's confirmation was to be given--many from churches, lodges, fraternities, sororities, and other organizations.29

Thus, the whole Negro race had been aroused in the Parker case. Dr. W. E. B. DuBois declared that:

> It was a campaign conducted with a snap, determination, and intelligence never surpassed in Negro America and very seldom in white. It turned the languid, half-hearted protest of the American Federation of Labor into a formidable and triumphant protest. It fired the labored liberalism of the West into flame. It was ready to beat back the enemy at every turn...So in every twist and turn of the enemy the battle was pressed down to the last minute.30

Then all of the opposition to Judge Parker has been brought

---


29Harpers Monthly Magazine, Volume 162, 239.

30The Crisis, June, 1930.
together one finds three reasons for his rejection by the Senate.
(The debates will take us too far afield were a discussion of
them and what was said in them undertaken here. For that reason
the Negro Representative Oscar DePriest has been left out of
this story, even though he used every influence at his command
to prevent Judge Parker's confirmation.)

First and foremost was his attitude toward the Negro.
Secondly, his attitude toward organized labor, and last but
still quite important was the belief and the fear on the part of
some southerners that Parker's nomination was an effort by the
Republicans to add North Carolina permanently to the Republican
fold. 31

That was by anybody's measurement one of the greatest
political demonstrations on the part of the Negro since the
Civil War, or at least since the end of the Reconstruction
period. 32 The effect of that political demonstration was felt
for some time thereafter. For example, one Kansas senator seeking
reelection the summer of 1930 in a district predominantly
Negro, polled only 27 per cent of the votes where normally the
Republicans polled 75 per cent of them. 33 In Ohio one finds a

31 Congressional Record, op. cit., Discussion between Senators
Stephens, Ashurst, and Caraway, pp. 3343-3344.

32 The Crisis, September, 1929, 63.

33 The Kansas City Call, July 9, 1930.
similar situation when Senator R. C. McCulloch was campaigning for re-election after he had filled the unexpired term of Senator Theodore E. Burton. The Negro voters of the state without regard to political affiliation and other circumstances united against Senator McCulloch because of his stand in the Parker Case.34

The importance of the Parker Case from the Negro's point of view lay in the fact that the Negro had come to believe that in the federal Supreme Court he stood his best chance of receiving justice. That court had rendered several decisions that had far-reaching effect on his constitutional rights.35 It was in consideration of their last resort when everything else had gone against them that they wanted a Supreme Court composed of members who had no antipathies against them. Since Judge Parker by the sins of commission—the campaign speeches in 1920—and the sin of omission—refusal to reply to the letters, telegrams, and telephone calls directed to him by the NAACP—was unfit for the bench, the Negroes assumed it as their responsibility to prevent, if possible, his confirmation. How well they succeeded is told by his overwhelming rejection by the Senate in 1930.

34 The Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 3, 1930.

35 Several of those cases are discussed by Monroe N. Work, The Negro Yearbook, Volumes for the years 1916-1940 inclusive, and several of the more recent cases are discussed by Florence Murray, The Negro Handbook, 1944, 30-42.
Another specific complaint which the Negro had against President Hoover and the Republican party was Mr. Hoover's attitude and policies toward the so-called "Lily White" movement. That movement did not begin with Mr. Hoover. The term is thought to have been coined in Texas in 1898 by the Negro Republican leader, Morris "Wright" Cuney. There seems to have been a riot between the Negro and white Republicans who were struggling for the control of a convention after which the term was applied to designate the white Republicans in that state and the rest of the southern states. Their objective was to purge the Republican party of the South of Negro leadership, Negro control and a share in the spoils of victory. Its argument was that the white South should divide between the major parties, that the time had come for many reasons for southerners to be converted to Republicanism, but that the southern white men would not join a Republican party which tolerated Negroes.

Prior to 1930 "Lily White" groups had functioned in every southern state except West Virginia and Kentucky, and had sometimes been sufficiently strong to give considerable trouble to Negro "regulars." Their object was, ostensibly, to attract white men into the party, and in order to accomplish that they

---


felt obliged to discourage Negro voters, dispose Negro committee-
men and convention delegates, and thus "clean up the party."
Thus we find in 1892 in the state of Texas, a group of white
Republicans revolted from the regular organization, held a con-
vention of its own and sent a contesting delegation to the
National Republican Convention. The white delegation was for
McKinley; while the Negro delegation was for either Allison or
Reed. Cuney and his friends were turned down for the McKinley
whites.33 The situation became so tense between the "Lily White"
faction and the so-called "Black and Tan" faction that at least
in one state an injunction was sought to prevent Negroes from
holding a state convention--Florida.39

In the entire political history of Virginia there had been
only two occasions prior to 1930 in which a real contest oc-
curred in the state's election sufficient to draw in the Negro
vote. The first in 1921 when the "Lily Whites" openly entered
the field, and the second was in 1929 when the "Hoovercrats"
and the regular Democrats split and sent separate nominees to
the November polls.40 In 1921 Henry W. Anderson had secured
control of the "Lily White" faction of the Republican State Con-

38 H. C. Hare, Norris Wright Cuney, The Associated Publishers,
Washington, D. C., 1913, 92.
40 Ibid., July 17, 1928.
vention, and instantly, a Negro ticket was put in the field. It is thought by some observers that this was not wholly a matter of rebuking the Anderson faction nor even preparing a show of strength to impress the national party organization. But that it was done after conferences with the white party officials—the object being to provide an outlet for Negro indignation without compromising the Democratic ticket by a sudden adherence of Negro voters.41 In the election which followed Trinkle's ticket won, Anderson ran second while Mitchell, the Negro aspirant for the governorship, ran third.42 There were some beliefs that Mitchell and his friends had been used to draw Negroes from the growing Republican opposition.43

By 1928 the "Lily White" organization rivaling the traditional Negro and regular bodies had sprung up in nearly every southern state except West Virginia and Kentucky. The events surrounding the nomination and election of Herbert Hoover gave them additional prominence, for in view of the confusion into which the South had been thrown by the nomination of the wet, Catholic, "Tammany" Smith the time seemed ripe for a genuine Republican campaign in the South. Mr. Hoover seems to have

41Ibid., August 6, 1928.
43That charge was heard frequently in Virginia, 1928, but the writer found no documents to support it, hence historical gossip.
hoped that by working through the "Lily White" organization and by use of underground party politics he would finally merge the South into an anti-Smith camp. 44

As the newspaper accounts are given of the Republican organization for 1923, they impress the reader as though the tide in that organization was running against the "black and tan" regulars. Ben Davis, colored National Committeeman from Georgia, was given money for the pre-convention expenses from a regular party source, yet he testified to his uneasiness over the officious activities of a white man, Clark Greer, who seemed to have been in charge for Mr. Hoover. 45 After Mr. Hoover's election his suspicion was borne out when Mr. Hoover discharged him (Ben Davis) from the Republican Council. 46 Perry W. Howard, another Negro "regular" who at that time was assistant United States Attorney General and National Committeeman from Mississippi, was permitted to bring a Hoover delegation to the convention, but had "to walk in fear of a 'Lily White'" organization which he claimed had been encouraged by Mr. Hoover at the time of the flood relief work of 1927. 47 During the cam-

44 New York Times, November 20, 1928. That editorial declared that Mr. Hoover did not intend to make a clean sweep of the "black and tan" Republicanism in the convention, but got appreciable support from it.


46 Ibid., November 20, 1928.

paign the work in Mississippi for the election of Mr. Hoover for president was in charge of the "Lily White" organization under Lamont Rowland, a recent accession to the party.

At that convention Walter Cohen, the Negro leader from Louisiana, was seated but the other eleven delegates, all "Lily White" Hoover men, were led by the "Lily White" Emil Kuntz.48 Henry W. Greager was in charge of a "Lily White" delegation from Texas and at that convention (1928) was seated over the protest of the Negro National Committeeman, "Goose Neck" Bill McDonald and his one white Republican Representative, Zurzback, who owed his seat to the Negro voters of San Antonio.49

Mr. Hoover was nominated and elected as was pointed out previously, largely because he had been successful in building up a "Lily White" organization in the South and because he was able to play upon the emotions of the people there in such a way as to turn them against his "wet, Catholic, Tammany" dominated rival, as Lamont Rowland of Mississippi puts it.50 After Mr. Hoover had taken office as President of the United States he made other utterances that not only clarified his position and policies relative to Negro consideration and deference but were

48Ibid., June 6 and 7, 1928.
49Ibid., June 6, 1928.
50Corinthian, Klyce and Bishop, Editors and Publishers, Corinth, Mississippi, November 14, 1928, a clipping sent from the above paper to the writer, March, 1933, by Lamont Rowland.
a reemphasis of his determination to "play ball" with the "Lily White" factions of the Republican party.

Successive presidents have long wished to build up a Republican party in the South such as would commend itself to the citizens of those states, he declared. (The implication here is that he did not regard the Negro as a citizen.) Then he commended the "Lily White" state committees in Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, and Florida, but said he,

In South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi, recent exposure of abuses in the sale of patronage obviously render it impossible for the old organization...to command the confidence of the administration...The duty of reorganization rests with the people of those states, and all efforts to that end will receive the hearty cooperation of the administration...If these three states are unable to initiate such an organization...the different federal departments will be compelled to adopt other measures to secure advice as to the selection of federal employees.51

That was by far the boldest and most expansive public gesture toward the "Lily Whites" that the writer has ever found made by a responsible Republican spokesman. It let the Negroes know anew that the Hoover administration did not want them and furthermore was not going to do anything for them. The situation then confronting the Negro in the South was this: the Republicans didn't want them in the party, the administration in Wash-

51 New York Times, March 27, 1929.
ton had repudiated them, and the Democrats as a whole then, would not have them.

Thus when the time for the meeting of the National Convention approached in July, 1932, the Negro press had pointed out so often to the Negro what Mr. Hoover's policies had been that Mr. Hoover did not have the best wishes of many of the Negro leaders. The contests between the Mississippi "Lily Whites" and the "Black and Tan" factions over which should be seated in Chicago was said to cost the state twelve ballots. In that state the white Republicans were controlled by Lamont Rowland, a wealthy lumber man of Corinth, Mississippi, while the "Black and Tans" were controlled by an eminent Negro physician, S. D. Redmond, assisted by Attorney Perry W. Howard and Mary C. Booze. J. C. Tyler, secretary of the State's Central Committee of the "Lily White" group claimed that he had received the official call from the national headquarters. What took place at the convention seems to indicate the corrections of Mr. Tyler's claim, for only a few Negro delegates were seated and those of Mississippi rejected.

There was a similar fight over the Georgia Republican delegates resulting in only two of the sixteen which Georgia

52 The Chicago Bee, May 1, 1932.
53 Ibid., May 1, 1932.
54 Ibid., July 26, 1932.
sent being Negroes—Benjamin Davis, former National Committeeman of the state and Dr. W. H. Harris. Clint W. Hagar, white, was given the place formerly held by Captain A. T. Walden in the 1928 convention. Opposition to the Negro in the party was led by a woman, Mrs. George S. William, Republican National Committeewoman of that state.

In Tennessee Robert Church had a fight with the "Lily Whites." C. A. Bruce, a wealthy lumberman who had once been a candidate for governor on the Republican ticket, headed the "Lily White" group. Robert Church headed the "Black and Tan" group. Their skirmish started when Bruce attempted to make a speech before a stormy convention in Memphis at which time Church's supporters jeered him down. Bruce then declared that he was out for Church's scalp, and would seek the recognition of his faction at Chicago. Bruce pointed out that his faction, "although known as the 'Lily White' group had some Negroes in it." Seven of his twenty delegates were Negroes.56

We have already seen that Walter Cohen of Louisiana and William McDonald of Texas, both of whom had dominated the Republican politics in their states, were personally seated, but the delegations which they led were either not seated at all or they were given only one-half vote. The 1932 convention marked

55 Ibid., April 17, 1932.
56 Ibid., AMP releases.
the first time that there had been such a fight over seating the Negro delegates since 1912, and the Hoover attitude and effort to build up a "Lily White" party in the South was thought to have been responsible for it. In consequence of that the Negro could not and did not support him unitedly in the campaign which followed. A close student of political affairs has made an analysis of the votes which the political parties polled for 1932. He found that the Negro clergymen and lawyers were predominantly Republicans in 1932; but the physicians, housewives, students, laborers, and domestic workers showed a preference for the Democratic candidate.57 Since the latter group contained the bulk of the Negroes of voting age that analysis leads to the conclusion that the Negro did not give Mr. Hoover their loyal support in 1932 as they had formerly given it to the Republican party.

A very brief statement should be made relative to another complaint which the Negroes had against the "Hoovercrats," for it was something that aroused much interest among the Negroes at the time. It was the segregation of the Gold Star Mothers when they planned to visit the graves of their sons who had fallen in France in World War I. Many outstanding Negro women refused to go in such a humiliating way and there were many protests.

filed with the Secretary of War, Patrick J. Hurley, about the affair. Secretary Hurley did not deny that the plan was to segregate the Gold Star Mothers, but tried to assure the Negroes that their accommodation would be in every respect the same as those of the whites. Those Negroes knew this assertion was untrue for at that very time the white women frequented the best hotels in New York, while the Negro women had to resort to the cheap boarding houses. A careful student of race relations declared that four hundred and fifty Negro women had planned to make the trip, but because of the Hoover policy of providing separate unequal accommodations only fifty-eight made it. After several protests had been filed with Secretary Hurley he compromised somewhat on his stand and declared that as far as he was concerned the women of both races could make the trip together, provided such an agreement could be reached among the women themselves.

The folly of the policy is emphasized when it is set over against the eloquent plea contained in an editorial of the Boston Post, under the title, "Be Fair to the Mothers." He

58 New York Times, July 11, 1930, 10. Also the Crisis, July, 1930.
59 Walter White, Executive Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in the Crisis, July, 1930.
60 Ibid., July, 1930.
Serious difficulties have arisen in connection with the tours of the Gold Star Mothers. Already nearly a third of the mothers assigned to the initial pilgrimage have withdrawn. Other cancellations are coming in daily.62

After this, Mr. Crozier made a plea for the government to give those who could not make the trip the actual cost of the trip in cash. That would amount to about $850; but one searches in vain for an expression from Mr. Hoover supporting the idea even though it was strongly urged upon him by the NAACP through its Executive Secretary, Walter White.63

The conclusion which the incidents related above lead one to draw is that the Republican party under Mr. Hoover had through the Parker Case, the "Lily White" policy and the Gold Star Mothers' affair alienated the Negro's loyalty to the party. Those grievances in addition to the grievances held by the general public, which held Mr. Hoover somewhat responsible for the business crash which began in 1929, had not only made the Negro exclaim in 1932 "Who but Hoover" but also made the nation at large join in the song. The election return is eloquent proof.

It would be missing the point to see the Negro revolting the Republican party fully in the 1932 election or to think that

62 Richard Crozier, editor, Post Publishing Company, Boston, Massachusetts, April 7, 1930.

63 The Crisis, July, 1930.
he became aware, for the first time, of the Republican insincerity and indifference during the Hoover administration. The truth of the matter is that certain Negroes had been cognizant of such a tendency since 1876 when it was thought that the Republicans made a deal with the South during the Hayes-Tilden deadlock whereby Hayes, the Republican candidate, was to be made president in return for which Mr. Hayes was to take the United States army out of the South and leave the Negro in the hands of their former slave masters. Nearly every anti-Negro policy found in any of the former Republican administrations was used by Mr. Hoover while he was in the White House. He neither showed deference to the Negro nor gave any unique positions to them. Such indifference seemed to increase the political friction between the Negro and the whites of the South as was evidenced by the formation of the "Loyal League" in Georgia. That League was a sort of bureau of the radical Republican party whose chief object was to control the Negro vote. The League did not oppose use of the franchise if it would aid in electing the kind of officers the whites had had since the overthrow of the Reconstruction government.

64 Chicago Bee, editorial, October 1, 1944. See also John R. Lynch, The Facts of Reconstruction, 156-161.

As we know, Mr. Hoover was badly beaten in the election of 1932 by Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Since 1933 the Republicans have tried to recapture the Negro vote in a variety of ways, but their vitriolic expressions, their skill in the manipulation of propaganda symbols, their emotional pleas, and their expenditures of large sums left Mr. Landon in 1936 and Mr. Willkie in 1940 in no better circumstance with the Negro than Mr. Hoover was in November, 1932.

The Republicans blamed the New Deal Relief, which was partly correct, for their losing the Negro vote, but they are equally at fault for they did nothing to prevent it. Earl Brown, writing for the Opportunity in December, 1936, estimates that over 2,000,000 Negroes voted in the election of that year. He asserts:

That was the first time since the Reconstruction Amendments that the majority of Negroes voted for a Democratic president. That situation made the race an integral part of both major parties and increased them in political stature and importance.66

He continued by pointing out three additional things this election implied or achieved. First, the increased political activity among Negroes in the South was the most important political movement for them and for the poor whites. The latter saw because the Negroes were disfranchised, they were too. Secondly,

66Opportunity, Volume XIV, Number 12, pp. 359-361.
more Negroes voted in the South than at any time since Reconstruction. In Durham, North Carolina, over 4000 voted as contrasted with about 500 in previous national elections. Thirdly, there was little opposition to the Negro's voting in many places; the press carried no releases about the whites intimidating the Negroes because some of them (Negroes) went to the polls. Fourthly, he claimed that the New Deal had abolished sectionalism to a greater extent than any other force in history.67

Between 1932 and 1940 the nation had seen the Negroes swing far to the left, not only by electing liberal-minded white men as Democrats to offices in the nation's capital, but it had also seen them elect a politically unknown Negro, Arthur Mitchell, who at the time had been in the district from which he was elected for less than six years. This election is all the more significant because he was elected over the militant Republican Negro Congressman, Oscar De Priest. Mitchell used as a slogan "forward with Roosevelt" while Oscar De Priest, the Republican, constantly appealed to the people to give him support because, first, he was a Republican, and secondly, because of his record. In 1936 we find that in the United States as a whole, sixteen Negroes were elected to the state legislatures--eleven Democrats and five Republicans. The state of Pennsylvania led with elect-

67 Ibid., 360.
ing five from the city of Philadelphia--one being Reverend Marshall Shepard who had offered prayer in the Democratic convention meeting at Philadelphia in July, 1940 causing some of the southern whites to revolt their party, for example, (Cotton Ed) Senator Edward Smith of South Carolina. The significant thing about that election is that the Negro showed a change in political thought that was far-reaching in that they not only revolted the Republican party in national politics but were seeking positions in state and national government on the Democratic ticket.

The Landon campaign was supported very mildly even by the Negro Republicans. In fact, some of the best Negro political minds which had formerly been Republicans fought him ferociously. For example, the learned Kelly Miller wrote a series of articles for the AMP in which he urged the Negroes to support President Roosevelt. Bishop R. R. Wright of the African Methodist Episcopal Church not only wrote articles for the AMP but organized a committee, the purpose of which was to fight Landon and the Republicans. How well they succeeded is seen in the election returns--Landon carried only two states and

68 For the states from which Negroes were elected and other data relative to the votes received, the opposing candidates, etc., see The Chicago Bee, November 15, 1936.

69 Ibid., October 11, 1936 and all of the November issues, 1936.

70 Ibid., November 3, 1936.
neither of those has a Negro population large enough to have swung the election for him had all of them supported the Republican candidate.

Mr. Wendell Willkie, the Republican standard-bearer in the 1940 campaign, was given far more support by Negroes than Mr. Landon had received four years earlier. The Negro press seemed less critical of him than of Mr. Landon, even though there was no outstanding Negro paper which unconditionally supported his candidacy. 71 Some of the minor Negro papers were found supporting both of the candidates. 72

The Republican situation as far as the Negro was concerned had made the Negro conscious of its lack of divinity. By 1940, he had come to look upon political parties somewhat as though they were two bottles which still retained on them their labels after the contents had been emptied. It was then (1940) a man-measure-matter with the Negro, not an emotional attachment to a party label. In the chapter which follows an attempt will be made to make that situation clear by considering other factors which entered the political equation; consideration will be given

---

71 The most popular Negro papers are: The Pittsburgh Courier, The Chicago Defender, The Afro-American, The Kansas City Call, and the Amsterdam News. Issues for October and November of those were consulted, and although they did not fight Mr. Willkie, they did not give open support to him.

72 Chicago see, St. Louis Argus, Black Dispatch for Roosevelt, while the New York Age, and the Cleveland Plain Dealer supported Willkie. See October and November issues, 1940.
to such questions as: How much did the indifference of the Republicans toward the Negro account for that changed position? How much did the positive aggression of the Democrats account for it? Were there other factors in the equation, and if so, did they wield much influence?
CHAPTER V

THE NEGRO AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

In 1940 the population of continental United States was 131,669,275; of that number Negroes constituted 12,865,518, or 9.7 per cent.\footnote{Florence Murray, The Negro Yearbook, 1944, 14-15; also World Almanac, 1945, 460 and 491.} In any group of such proportions it would be most unusual if there were no instances of some of the group who had never been associated with other organizations if both its members and the other organizations had had a fairly long history. Research reveals the fact that in certain localities Negroes had been affiliated with the Democratic party for many years prior to 1932--proof that exclusion of the black man from participation in activities of the party was not a universal practice. In Chapters III and IV it was established that prior to 1932 most of the Negroes in the United States were Republicans, and had been Republicans since the time the party was organized. The fact, however, cannot serve as a basis for an assumption that Negroes are 100 per cent Republican throughout the United States. Indeed there have been instances, beginning shortly after the emancipation, of some of them aligning them-

\footnote{Claude McKay, Harlem: Negro Metropolis, E. P. Dutton and Company, New York, 1940, Chapters 2-4.}
selves with the Democratic party. There have been also some ad-
vocacy for them to desert the Republican party, advocacy which began shortly after emancipation. Such advocacy has increased
in intensity and quantity since the turn of the century. The
Negro's affiliation with the Democratic party in recent years,
therefore, can be considered a new alignment only in the sense
of having a new welcome by a larger number of Democrats. Demo-
crats made a new appeal for Negro support, and thereby attracted
a large number of new Negro recruits most of whom were formerly
Republicans. Probably it would be informative to cite a few
instances of their early alignment with the Democratic party in
support of this assertion.

As early as 1868 the Democratic party in New York City
secured John A. Nail, a Negro saloon keeper and one of the lead-
ing citizens of his community, to set up a Negro Democratic club
in that city. He directed its activities in the interest of
Democrats until he retired to private life in 1900. He was suc-
ceeded by Ferdinand Q. Martin, who regularly campaigned for
election of Democratic candidates until in 1920 the club was put
in charge of the skillful and eloquent Mrs. Bessye Bearden. During the long history of the club's existence, Negroes were
abundantly rewarded in many ways.

There are many examples of Negroes becoming increasingly

\[3\text{Ibid., 124-131.}\]
aware of the wisdom of aligning themselves with more than one political party. For example, in 1905 the Niagara movement was initiated by a group of prominent Negro educators and influential citizens. Among the many things which they did were the following: to condemn in strong language the Republican party for having obtained Negro support under false pretense; to recommend a change, or at least a modification, in the future alignment of the Negro; and to dedicate themselves to a program of political uplift and enlightenment for that race. 4

In 1906, the popular and influential New York Age, a Negro weekly, gave its support to the same thesis when its courageous editorial declared:

When the Negro leaders learn how to utilize the fact that the Democratic party (at the North at any rate) would be glad to get the Negro vote and that the Republican party would be aghast at losing it, they will no longer have reason to complain of political neglect. 5

In some circles the question is still debated whether newspapers make public opinion or whether they reflect it. Such a debate may have value in arriving at certain technical decisions relative to priority. In the matter under consideration, however,


5 Ibid., Volume VIII, 1906, 221; quoting the New York Age.
it is sufficient to know there was a prominent Negro leader who, while editor of a popular Negro weekly, exhibited sufficient courage, foresight, and wisdom to warn his people of the folly of affiliating themselves with only one political party.

A similar position to that expressed by the New York Age was taken in 1908 by Dr. Horace Blumstead, (white) president of Atlanta University, a Negro school, when he urged Negroes to desert the Republican party and support a new third party as a means of preventing his extinction as a political factor. He declared:

For years the Republican party has been showing a diminishing disposition to do anything for the protection of the Negro and an increasing acquiescence in the placing of liabilities upon him by unfriendly hands. The case has been aggravated by the fact that the Negro has not asked for special legislation in his interests as for a race that wanted to be petted and coddled, but simply for the protection of his ordinary rights of citizenship as conferred upon him by law, and especially by the war amendments to the United States constitution which were secured by the Republican party. 6

Again in October 1908 some Negroes of Brooklyn, New York, effected an organization which had as one of its objectives freeing their race from representation by white Republicans, the few Negroes who were selfishly seeking office, and the few office-holders attentive only to their own interests. The editor

of the Public commented upon the movement as follows:

If that organization was made in good faith it deserves encouragement. It is natural enough for Negroes in gratitude for its having released them from slavery to vote for the Republican party long after it has ceased to represent the least anti-slavery spirit...The persistency of the Negro in herding together in politics, not for their race but for conscienceless exploiter of both races has been their greatest weakness.7

Such comments and excerpts representing as they do a variety of opinions, foreshadow the Negroes' affiliation with the Democratic party since 1932. Consequently it was not solely the result of the personality, the program and the pull of F. D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, nor was it the result of Herbert Hoover and the Republicans; both helped to hasten it on, but it was, in part at least, due to serious thought on part of some of the Negro leaders. Such thought, in some instances, goes back to the period of reconstruction or shortly after the Civil War.

The history of the United States is replete with examples of the manner which a crisis brings people's attention to a focal point relative to far-reaching reforms and procedures. The mere suggestion of the crisis itself will recall to the student of American history the reforms which followed the crisis. Thus the Revolutionary War, the formation of the Constitution,

7 The Public, October 27, 1908, Volume 9, 551-552.
the Revolution of 1800, the calamity of 1819, the Civil War, the panic of 1873, the business failures of 1893, the Bull Moose upsurge of 1912, the World War, 1917-1918, and the severe economic crisis beginning 1929, all of these broke in upon the ordinary routine of life and were accompanied by a series of modifications in both thought and action.

When all has gone well, not as when former Senator Huey P. Long of Louisiana said "every man a king" becomes a reality, or as Dr. F. E. Townsend had it: "ham and eggs for breakfast for every man," are easily available, there is little thought for any beyond the routine needs. The crisis tends to awaken people out of their slumber; they are inclined not only to wonder how they got into the difficulty but also to try to devise schemes for getting out. In nearly every American crisis there has been an upturn of liberal ideas and a breaking away from traditions. If we go back no further than the economic crisis of 1893 we will find the Populist party giving its support to such a contention by its attack upon "accumulated wealth." An examination of its platform of 1899 reveals a number of planks so far-reaching in popular appeal that the Hanna, the Lodge, and the McKinley group had to recede from their conservative positions. A crisis, therefore, affects the political thought and behavior of most

———

people: rich, poor, colored, white, the majority, and the minority.

The crisis which occurred in 1929 brought the Negro into the Democratic fold as much as any single event. Indeed, if Hoover had been president during a period of prosperity, his indifference toward the Negro, his "Lily White" policy, the Parker nomination, and the Gold Star Mothers' controversy would probably have been ignored and to some extent forgotten. However, such a combination of incidents was more than the Negroes or the whites could stand; hence in 1932 there was a landslide for Franklin D. Roosevelt, who polled 472 electoral votes to Hoover's 59.9

A discussion of the Negro in the National Democratic Convention would have little, if any, merit in this dissertation. Not until the convention of 1936 were there any Negro delegates; there were thirty at that convention. Prior to this the Democrats did not want the Negroes and Negroes in large numbers did not seek membership with the Democratic party. But, after the Roosevelt landslide of 1932 the picture began to change; there was a kind of feeling of mutual dependence upon each other, the Democrats depending upon the Negroes' vote because in many places Negroes constituted the balance of power in a closely contested election, and the Negro depending upon the Democrats

9World Almanac, 1933, 737.
because the Democrats were in power and had control of much of
the employment and nearly all of the relief. So the Negro vote
in certain pivotal states would constitute a kind of assurance
for a Democratic victory if the election there was close; for
the Negro to declare himself to be a Democrat or to register as
a Democrat was a kind of assurance of continuing to receive re-
lief aid or a relief job. In Chicago, for example, the ward
committeeman of the Fourth Ward had a list of the jobs printed
that would be available after the election. These jobs could
be obtained only upon the recommendation of the precinct cap-
tains. It is obvious that the precinct captains would desig-
nate and recommend only party adherents. Therefore, one factor
which brought large numbers of Negroes to the Democratic party
was the relief and employment situations.

Another factor was the personality and the philosophy of
the President. A discussion of his personality would lead into
a field which does not form a part of this dissertation psychol-
ogy, but the President's political philosophy cannot be ignored.
He did not take the position that the strength of the country
was to be found solely in the fighting forces; but his position
was "the strength of this country is to be found somewhat in the

10Harold F. Gosnell, *Negro Politicians*, The University of
intelligence, the freedom, and the health of the people." The slogans, "The New Deal" and "No Forgotten Man" especially appealed to the Negro; for many of them felt that the race had been in need of a new deal in politics in the United States since the withdrawal of the federal troops from the South shortly after the reconstruction period. Indeed, many Negroes were cognizant of the fact that in things political and social the presidents and the administrations had conveniently and consistently forgotten them. Negroes asked "where are the spoils of victory, and where is the trust, the honor and the deference which the candidate promised?" In view of such considerations, the slogans "New Deal," and "No Forgotten Man" coming as they were from an administration which was keeping its promises by providing work and increasing relief allotments it made a very strong appeal to the Negroes.

Slogans without positive, concrete acts would have little effect, for the life of a nation or of a race cannot forever be stimulated solely by slogans. Indeed hungry humanity requires deeds, actions, and concrete proof for such assertions as a "New Deal," or "No Forgotten Man." Accordingly, President Roosevelt launched his great humanitarian program under a series of alpha-


betical designations, some of which are AAA, CCC, HOLC, NYA, PWA, and WPA. These dealt with nearly every phase of human welfare. Such a program if it could have been free from spoils, such as some of the politicians practiced, would have, nevertheless, brought into the Democratic party a large number of new Negro recruits, for by the middle of 1934, President Roosevelt had given Negroes more favorable consideration by appointing members of that race to administrative positions than had ever been given by any other president.  

Most of those positions had to do with the administration of the welfare agencies; it was by means of those agencies that President Roosevelt intended to relieve the country from the distress of the depression and restore public confidence. How well he succeeded is indicated by his "purge" from the party of certain individuals who opposed his program and by the election returns in 1936. In 1932, Roosevelt's popular vote was 7,060,016 more than Hoover's (Roosevelt--22,821,857; Hoover--15,761,841) and as stated above he received 472 of the electoral votes; while Hoover received 59. In 1936, however, President Roosevelt polled 27,476,673; while Governor Landon polled 16,679,583, that is, Roosevelt had 10,797,090 more popular votes and 523 electoral votes out of a

---


The significance expressed and implied by the above statistics lies in the fact that Mr. Roosevelt was more popular after his first term than before.

It would be a grave error to assume that President Roosevelt kept all of the planks in the Democratic platform or all of his pre-election promises. Presently it will be shown that this was not the case. "Platforms are made for candidates to stand on before elected and to lie on after election" is a witticism which expresses with accuracy and aptness the American political experience. There has not been a president from Washington to Roosevelt who has not been accused by his political adversaries of ignoring or disregarding or discarding his pre-election promises. In fact, it is no reflection upon the honor and integrity of a president if he is forced to do so in the light of changing conditions. Any efficient administration should be actuated not entirely by campaign pledges but by the exigency of the situation. For example, Abraham Lincoln was elected on a platform which bound him not to interfere with the institution of slavery in states where it already existed, yet by an autocratic assumption of power he issued the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves in the interest of humanity.  

15World Almanac, 1945, 724, 725.
Wilson ran on a platform which limited the President's tenure to a single term, yet he sought and secured renomination and reelection.17 His friends promised that he would keep the United States out of war before his second election, however, after the election, he recommended that the nation should enter the worst war to which the United States had ever been a party. He was guided and controlled in each instance by imperative events. Therefore, to those who denounced President Roosevelt for ignoring his pre-election promises to curtail expenses, the President could have rejoined that to have to do so would have been a crime against humanity in the light of the existing situation.

In the 1936 campaign, Governor Landon, the Republican candidate, had much to say about the President's failure to keep his promises, at the same time he indulged more profusely in pre-election promises than any other presidential candidate in the history of this country; he averred, for example, with the solemnity of a religious vow that if elected, he would keep his promises. Then promised to reduce taxes, curtail the budget and to pay off the debt, take care of the unemployed, remedy the generation-old complaint of the farmer, conserve the eroding soil, provide security against old age and the hazards of in-

17 C. E. Merriam, Four American Party Leaders, The Macmillian Company, New York, 1926, 49-50; "You can build a flimsy platform and stand on it successfully, provided its basis is in the right kind of spirit," quoting Writings, II, 418.
industry, compose the conflict between capital and labor, bring about recovery and set the nation to rights. It seems that he thought he could satisfy the voters with the song, "Oh Promise Me." A single citation will show how Governor Landon kept his promise while chief executive of the state of Kansas. The following excerpt is taken from the *Afro-American* of October 3, 1936:

Atchinson, Kansas--Dr. D. L. Stewart, leading physician of this city, has taken the lead in organizing "Roosevelt for President" clubs as a rebuke to Governor Landon for his failure to keep his promises to eradicate discrimination from the Kansas University Medical School.

In a statement to the *Afro-American* Dr. Stewart, who prior to Governor Landon's second term was an ardent Republican, declared that he would not oppose Governor Landon if the latter had merely failed to take those steps as a matter of course. But, declared Dr. Stewart:

While he was campaigning for election the first time I invited him to my private office and had him confer with ten leading colored Republicans of the community. At that meeting we told him of the conditions which existed at Kansas University Medical School. He expressed surprise, and gave us his word that if elected, he would correct that evil. It was only upon his promise that we went to work and put him over.

A little further Dr. Stewart continued:

---

Chicago Tribune, October 12, 1936; text of Landon's Columbus, Ohio, speech, page 2. Also speech at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October 27, and Madison Square Garden, October 29.
After two terms or office conditions at the University of Kansas are not only the same, but are growing worse each year and Landon refuses to lift a hand. This is only one of the charges we have against him, but I cite this merely because it involves a definite promise and proves him to be a man who will not keep his word to colored voters.19

Dr. Stewart had by that statement struck a responsive chord with many Negroes, for, following the publicity which the Negro press gave to the exposure—such publicity is in its own right significant—several of the leaders of Negro thought began to speak for President Roosevelt's re-election and against Governor Landon. Professor Kelly Miller, a scholar of no mean repute, wrote several articles under the title, "Why the Negro Should Vote for President Roosevelt." These were released by the Associated Negro Press for public consumption.20 In some of those articles he made a careful comparison of the programs on which they were campaigning; in one particular article his analysis led to the conclusion that Landon was "nothing but negatives as far as the good of the Negro is concerned, while Roosevelt is an accumulation of positives for our best interests."21 His article of October 11 was especially strong. In it he pointed out with

19Afro-American, October 3, 1936.
20Chicago Bee, October 4, 11, 18, 25, 1936. Also the Pittsburgh Courier, October 5, 12, 19, 26. The Kansas City Call, October 5, 12, 19, 26.
21Chicago Bee, October 4, 1936.
great skill and clarity how a vote for Landon was a vote against the Negroes' best interest. His language here is sufficient in itself for the matter at hand.

During the free silver craze when the western Republicans combined with the southern Democrats to kill the Federal Election Bill in exchange for the support of free silver, John M. Langston (colored Representative from Virginia) declared that they had crucified the Negro for thirty-pieces of silver. Today the Republican party has shifted its position from the advocacy of strong federal government to that of defender of states rights unmindful of the incidental sacrifice of the Negro by the exchange.

After this assertion he had much to say about the exchange of the position of the Republicans and the Democrats, the causes for it and the consequences of it; he declared,

The Democratic party historically stood for local sovereignty as expounded by Calhoun, the Negro's arch enemy and the premier defender of human slavery. It was to right that pernicious doctrine that the Republican party was founded...The Republican party cannot expect the Negro to follow in its recreancy (cowardly policy)...Surely the Negro cannot be expected to stultify his intelligence or stupify his conscience at the behest of the G.O.P., which once meant the "Grand Old Party." Although political exigencies may require him to change his political affiliations, he cannot change his political principles.

With eloquent persuasion sufficient to lead to conviction he identified the present day Republican party with the states' rights doctrine and continued:
What would the return to states rights mean to the Negro? The bulk of the race still resides in the South where the white race has never accepted the intent and purpose of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to give the Negro full political and civil equality with other American citizens. Any increase in the power or authority of those states would undoubtedly be used to restrict and curtail the political rights and privileges which they have been constrained to permit the Negro to exercise under compulsion of federal authority.

At that point the keen minded writer seems to have endeavored to bring the situation close to the non-intellectual voter. He added:

Suppose the question of relief were left to the southern states. Does anyone believe that the Negro would get his just and equitable proportion? Who would expect Alabama, Louisiana, or Mississippi to award the Negro an equal portion with the whites unless under compulsion of federal authority. When the Negro wished to secure an anti-lynch law, or relief from harsh discrimination in travel, or the right to serve on the grand juries, or the obliteration of white primaries, he appealed to the United States Supreme Court, not the courts of sovereign southern states. The Scottsboro boys would have been instantly sent into eternity if the issue had been left to the state of Alabama...Let the Negro ponder long and well before he casts his ballot for a candidate or a party which now reverts to the doctrine of states rights which has been the source of his immemorial evils.

The reason for quoting from this article at length is easily understood when it is pointed out that its writer was not a

22Ibid., October 11, 1936.
politician and had no personal "axe to grind." As Dean of the Junior College of Howard University, rated as the foremost Negro University in the United States, and as author of several works in the fields of social sciences and mathematics, he not only had economic security, but also security among members of the Negro race in regard to integrity, character, wisdom, and judgment--those gave him security of status. His fight against the election of Governor Landon and the Republican candidates because they had joined hands with the believers in states right philosophy, and his endorsement of President Roosevelt constituted one of the strongest possible Negro vote-getting devices. The truth of this expression is indicated in the fact that his articles were released through the ANP and consequently appeared on front pages of the newspapers. The fact of their appearance on front pages of the newspapers is also significant for such implies sanction of their content by those papers.

One other prominent non-politician among Negroes should be mentioned as contributing to their changed political thought in a substantial way--Bishop R. R. Wright, Jr., of the African

23 Kelly Miller is author of several scholarly works, among them are the following: (1) The Everlasting Stain, (2) From Servitude to Service, (3) The Leopard's Spots, (4) college text in Geometry; has also contributed articles to several of the best magazines. In those articles he dealt with different phases of Negro life and culture. He was the founder of the Sanhedrin, a movement, the purpose of which was to solve the Negroes' civic, social, and political problems in America by education and peaceful means.
Methodist Episcopal Church. He urged Negroes to support President Roosevelt because Republicans were responsible for the following: (1) The breadlines; (2) the loss of life-savings; (3) people's inability to send their children to school as a consequence of these losses; (4) Republicans made it hard to get homes to live in even though Negroes had to pay exorbitant rents; (5) they made it hard to borrow money from the banks; and (6) tenant farmers and sharecroppers were virtually re-enslaved by conditions of peonage. After having placed those charges against the Republicans (some of which cannot be sustained) he declared that President Roosevelt and the New Deal were correcting most of those evils. "There has been no president since Lincoln who has stood for justice for all 'the forgotten men' like Franklin D. Roosevelt." 24

The previous pages have shown how the Roosevelt administration or the "New Deal" attracted into its fold Negroes in every walk of life—those on relief in cities, farmers, domestic work-

24 The Chicago Bee, November 3, 1940. It was reliably reported that the Bishop threatened to "leave without appointment" any minister in his area who publicly supported the Republican ticket in 1940. No documents support this charge, and since "no document, no history" is a generally accepted historical principle, the charge is relegated to the waste pile of historical gossip; however the writer of this dissertation, a son of a Methodist minister, has known threats of such a nature to have been made and executed, even when so much was not at stake. The report may be untrue about the Bishop mentioned above—he hopes that it is untrue—but it could be true.
ers, professional politicians, college professors, and some high church officials. If the situation had stopped there, it would have been far short of opening the doors of democracy wider than they had been opened before. These considerations make it necessary to find out what else was done, if anything, to raise the status of the Negro to a full American citizen.

In support of President Roosevelt in the campaigns of 1932, 1936, and 1940 the Negro had acquired a new knowledge of his political importance in the United States.2 The arguments for a reduction of the number of representatives in Congress from the South, as was stipulated in the Fifteenth Amendment, had about ceased. The Negro was still disfranchised in the South for all practical purposes—eight states by a state-wide rule barred them from participating in the nominating process under the white primacy.25 The Negroes in the North had not been sufficiently concentrated (until recent years) since 1920 to get elected to national offices; however they renewed their efforts to obtain local and state offices by election. Thus between 1932 and 1940 the following states have elected the following Negroes

25In 1930 those states were: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. See Monroe N. Work, Negro Yearbook, 1937-1938, 103-104.
to their legislatures.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>NAME OF PERSON</th>
<th>CITY FROM</th>
<th>HOUSE OR</th>
<th>POLITICS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>HOUSE OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Harris B. Gains</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William E. King</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warren B. Douglass</td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. H. Smith</td>
<td>E. St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. J. Jenkins</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wm. A. Warfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernest A. Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard A. Harewood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>H. J. Richardson</td>
<td>Indnpls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. V. Stanton</td>
<td>E. Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. A. Tailey</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>W. M. Blount</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William H. Towers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Chas. W. Anderson</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Charles Diggs</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>John Adams, Jr.</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>J. M. Burrell</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. S. Hargraves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. R. Moorehead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>James Stevens</td>
<td>N.Y. City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William T. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert W. Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>R. P. McClain</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>J. W. Harris, Jr.</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. B. Hart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. C. Asbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hobson Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshall Shepard</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. K. Jackson</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. S. Brown</td>
<td>IndependentPittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. F. Thompson</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. D. Holmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. H. Brigerman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Allman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Stewart A. Calhoun</td>
<td>Keystone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleming Jones</td>
<td>McDowell Cnty.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the period 1932-1936, there were thirty-seven Negroes elected to state legislatures, twenty-one on Republican tickets, sixteen Democrats and one Independent. These facts are significant politically, since Negroes were elected to office running on the Democratic ticket in several border states. One is almost tempted to speculate relative to what would happen in regard to political alignments if that policy continued in the future. The picture since 1936 is more convincing that the Negro was turning his attention from the Republican party as his savior. Notice the Negroes elected to state legislatures since 1936. For convenience the alphabetical order is used: 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>House or Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. W. Anderson</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. T. Andrews</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.L.Brockenbour</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. S. Brown</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Burrows</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles C. Diggs</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.K.Gillespie</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Grant</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>E.Chicago</td>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. F. Hawkins</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. S. Hunter</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>E.Chicago</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. E. Jacks</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J.Warfield</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list shows there were as many Negro Democrats elected to the different state legislatures between 1936-1940 as there were Republicans—during the period each party acquired eight additional seats.

The number of Negroes elected to city councils would not be very revealing in this study because in many of the larger cities the city charters stipulate "the election shall be non-partisan," however, we find those Democratic strongholds have a larger list of Negroes than the Republican strongholds.28 The inference is more Negroes were being elected to the city councils when they were known or thought to be Democrats.

The appointive offices which have been given to Negroes in this period, 1932-1940, cover a variety of fields ranging from one federal judgeship—Judge William H. Hastie (succeeded by Judge H. E. Moore) to several aids, attorneys, assistants, specialists, directors, and analysts in nearly every agency which was established by the New Deal.29 (The name or the office and the officer is given by Florence Murray in her excellent work.)

The conclusion to which one is led after having studied those data relative to the Democratic party and the Negro is the Democratic party was far more considerate of the Negro's

28 Ibid., 160.
29 Ibid., 154-157.
interest since 1932 than was the Republican party. The situation was not then (1932-1940) ideal, for anyone who follows the doings in Congress and the pronouncements of certain responsible officials would know that there were still many Democrats who were as bitterly opposed to the Negro in this period as ever before--Bilbo, Rankin, Caraway, Smith, Talmadge, and George, just to name a few of them. The trend seems, however, to have been toward a more tolerant attitude in the South, while in the North definite effort was made to keep the Negro in the Democratic fold.30

Considerable space and time might be used in showing how some policies of the Democratic party, which has great strength in the South, still oppose racial justice. It would be difficult to find a federal agency under the New Deal which has not practiced racial discrimination and segregation in some form. As an example in proof one needs only to notice the administration or the alphabetical agencies mentioned earlier in this work. It was a Democratic Congress which made it difficult to pass anti-poll tax and anti-lynching bills in the lower house and impossible to pass them in the upper chamber; it was also a Democratic administration, although the Secretary of the Navy was reputedly Republican, which denied Negroes rank in the Navy

at the beginning of World War II. Therefore, despite the fact Negroes have gone into the party in large numbers, it is not at all certain that they will remain. This all the more probable since the party has no appealing leadership today, 1945, as it had when Negroes entered in such large numbers in 1932. #

It would be grossly incomplete were this dissertation to ignore the nomination and campaign of Wendell L. Willkie. In 1940, the Republican Convention, meeting in Philadelphia, nominated for the presidency Wendell Lewis Willkie, formerly of Indiana. He, at the time (1932) was a resident of New York City. He had never held public office, but had shown considerable ability and skill as a business executive when President of the Commonwealth and Southern Corporation, a public utility. He was what is generally called a "Wall Street" candidate and for that reason was thought by many to be opposed to most of the New Deal reforms. 31 The assumption was unfounded, however, as his acceptance speech at Elwood, Indiana, and other activities later showed. In fact he swallowed the New Deal almost whole, rejecting only the parts that penalized business. 32

#The writer is cognizant of his not being an historian in the above assertion.

31Chicago Times, R. F. Finnegan, Editor, S. E. Thomason, Publisher, Chicago, Illinois; issues from October 27, to November 6, 1940, especially the November 3rd issue.

Prior to 1935, he had been consistently a Democrat in his politics, but partly because of the New Deal policy toward big business he had ceased to be a member of that party and seems to have become an independent. After 1935, consider his own expression:

Why should I for the sake of conformity, catalog myself under one of two labels when neither suits me? My political philosophy agrees with neither that of the New Deal nor that of the Republicans as advanced by their leaders. I will not be a liar.\(^33\)

At best, he was a recent accession to the Republican party when he was nominated for the presidency in 1940.

Any discussion of his early life and political philosophy would have significance in this writing only insofar as they attracted or repelled Negro support.

For this reason, both are sketched. He was born in Elwood, Indiana, a small town in which there hung a sign in large letters, "Niggers, don't let the sun go down on you here."\(^34\) This sign had been there for years and was not taken down until the day Wendell L. Willkie was nominated. The fact that he was neither mayor of the town nor the holder of any public office could not be used as a convincing argument to prove his disapproval of it. Many Negroes were of the opinion, since his father was one

\(^{33}\)Current History, February, 1940, pp. 21-22.

\(^{34}\)Chicago Bee, November 3, 1940.
of the leading citizens there, that he or his father could have
done something about it if either had wanted to. To do nothing
or to remain silent about such a matter was tantamount to en-
dorsing it or to sanctioning it.\footnote{Ibid., November 10, 1940.} Willkie himself had previously
shown an intolerant attitude toward the Negro, at least on
one occasion. He was charged with always insisting upon the
fact that he was a white man. The following incident is of-
ered in proof: Once, a newspaperman approached him for an
explanation of something he had written, which was not in keep-
ing with good Democratic practice, nor to the best interest of
the Negro, and his only defense for the insult to the Negro was
concluded in that expression, "I am a white man." Mr. Rainey,
the newspaperman who relates the story, concluded the expression
spoke for itself relative to his attitude toward the Negro:

Mr. Willkie is a white man who wants emphatical-
ly to impress you. I am firmly convinced that
he would be a white man's president and a white
man's president alone (if he were elected).\footnote{Ibid., November 3, 1940.}

The Negro's attitude toward Mr. Willkie was affected un-
ravorably by the anti-Negro sign displayed in his home town and
by his insistence that he was a white man. To many, this insis-
tence implied that he felt himself under no moral obligation
to justify anything he had said about Negroes, especially to
Negroes, even though such assertions might be regarded by his listeners or readers as unfair and therefore offensive.

It is not necessary to repeat the fact that the Negro in 1940 had come to identify his interest largely with those of the New Deal which was anti-big business in a sense and liberal. Mr. Willkie was definitely pro-big business and at least inclined toward conservatism. His philosophy then was a philosophy which many Negroes interpreted as being contrary to their continued civic and political progress. Thus Bishop R. R. Wright declared, "There is no hope for Negroes in Willkie's candidacy."37

In spite of the anti-Negro sign in his home town and the claim of his intolerant attitude Mr. Willkie was far more popular with Negroes than the Republican standard-bearer of 1936. There seem to be two basic reasons for it: (1) Willkie adopted many of the New Deal reforms and policies and (2) Negroes were made to feel that President Roosevelt's efforts to obtain a third term implied a dictatorship for America. Such orators as Roscoe Conklin Simmons and Patrick B. Prescott, and Reverend-Attorney Archibald C. Carey made much ado over the suffering of minorities wherever dictators reign.38 So the adoption of a

37Chicago Defender, November 4, 1940.
38Pittsburgh Courier, October 27, 1940; also theChicago Defender, November 4, 1940.
liberal platform and Roosevelt's third term aspirations were, at least partly, responsible for the increase of Willkie's popularity over that of Mr. Landon's in 1936. In Negro districts of such cities as Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Philadelphia the votes for the two candidates—Willkie and Roosevelt—were pretty well balanced. The votes of the nation as a whole show Willkie to have been far more popular than Landon had been four years earlier; Willkie received 82 electoral votes as compared to Landon's 8 and Willkie's popular vote was 22,237,266 as compared to Landon's 16,679,538. President Roosevelt's popular vote was about the same in each election—in 1936, 27,476,673; in 1940, 27,443,466—but there was a Republican increase for the entire nation of 5,725,172. Prior to 1932, those areas in the northern cities where Negroes live and vote, had consistently gone Republican, with the exception of a few districts in New York City and Boston. The running on a Republican ticket meant the area in those northern cities in which Negroes dwelt were safe for Republican candidates. But in 1936, they went strongly for the Democrats; in 1940, balanced between Republicans and Democrats, thereby paving the way for

the Negro as an independent in politics which will be the next chapter in this study. That chapter will be short but significant since both Willkie and Roosevelt are now dead and the loyalty of the Negro to their respective parties was somewhat influenced by the personalities of those men.

CHAPTER VI
THE NEGRO: INDEPENDENT OF PARTY LABELS

The findings recorded in this chapter are the results of a careful study of the trends in the political responses and behavior of the Negro since 1932. An effort is made to record in a scientific way what has taken place in the political thought of the Negro—not what ought to have taken place. His position today, that is, independent of party labels, is of such recent date that only trends in the direction of independence can be documented. The paucity of documents, however, does not mean a paucity of reason. On the contrary, there is abundance of reason for the independence of the Negro to party labels today. Therefore, reason is given in support of every assertion, however, most of the assertions result from observations and analysis.

The Negro finds himself since 1936 in the best position, politically, he has ever known in this country. His bolt of the Republican party in 1932, his wholesale support of the Democratic ticket in 1936, his divided support between the Republican and the Democrats in 1940, the nomination of James Ford, a Negro, on the Communist ticket for the vice-presidency in 1936, are among the incidents which brought forcibly to his
mind the fact that voting, the use of the elective franchise, should be a sensible act, not an emotional one. Attachment on the basis of sentimentality, therefore, had to be discarded to make place for rationality. Issues and men had become far more important than party labels. That position made both parties hear him when he spoke, and make worthwhile bids for his support. Both of the major parties—the Republicans who repudiated him, and the Democrats, who did not want him—since 1936 have a sense of security when it can count on the Negro's support. His independence has given him new freedom.

None doubts that freedom is spiritually and physically invigorating. The United States of America is a land in which men are free or have hope of freedom. It was in a quest for freedom that the nation had its inception; and since its birth, it has blessed with a great number of truly great men who have made substantial and powerful contributions to the concept of freedom.¹ The phenomenal growth of the country and its spectacular development are testimony to its spiritual and physical vigor. All segments of the population of this promised land found their functions and their places, and made their contributions to its now undoubted genius, power and prominence. Of all these, the Negro segment feels aggrieved that it too is not now a fully

¹The list is a long and opposing one, embracing men in the fields of letters and religion, as well as in politics or statescraft.
accredited and participating member in the blessings and benefits, duties and responsibilities which American citizenship ought to confer. Instead, he finds himself with something less than full citizenship. He finds himself a minority problem, with all that the term connotes, in a land in which philosophically and doctrinally such a thing can have no existence. The fact that it does exist and that it is inconsistent with the delineations of the American dream is the creation of the problem.

The so-called Negro problem in America is complex, involved and bewildering. The pattern of Negro life and thought in respect to the overall national pattern is in a state of constant ferment. The differences and changes from area to area and from time to time are confusing, inconsistent, unreasonable, and at times, disheartening. This lamentable state of affairs, on the one hand, is the result of and is intensified by the Negro's effort to free himself from his submerged position, and on the other hand, the social inter-tia which flows from the reluctance of the non-Negro to forego traditional attitudes and stereotyped customs. This reluctance is reflected in the de-

2Rayford W. Logan, editor, What the Negro Wants, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1944. Dr. Logan finds the Negro in the United States to be a "third-rate" citizen only, and in many places unable to enjoy the liberties accorded aliens and enemies. Chapter I.

3Ibid., 6-9.
termination of too many Americans to maintain the status quo. This tug-o-war and struggle for stature occasions in the Negro a welter of emotional disturbances and traumatic experiences, which in turn have stimulated a tremendous assortment of organizations and individuals determined to find a way out of this dilemma. The organizations and individuals pursued different courses, used different techniques, commanded varying amounts of support and enthusiasm, but all were working sincerely to effect an improved status for the Negro in America, even though each had chosen a different facet or "front."

Few, if any, Negroes minimized the importance of the political front. Among those who have worked on it were an ever-increasing number of so-called "Independent Negro voters." In those sections of the country where the Negro had unrestricted access to the ballot, there has been an observable tendency on the part of large numbers of them not to adhere to rigid party affiliations. To arrive at that situation has not been an easy task for those voters. The Negro has had a long history of allegiance to the Republican Party, and for the most part, has affectionately known no other. For years, the Democratic Party

---

4 A few of the cases in point are:
   b. The "Forty-Ninth State Movement," see Opportunity, April, 1938, 106-109, June, 1939, 164ff.
label alone was enough to give the Negro voter a "blind spot" in respect to the worth and merit of any candidate or principle of that party. Happily, changes have been wrought in this matter, due in large part to population shifts occasioned by two great wars, the concentration of Negroes in urban and industrial centers of the North, and the power, and efficiency of "big political machines" with their broad gauge policy of appealing to and skillfully harmonizing racial and economic pressure groups.

In theory, the American Negro, like other Americans, is generally regarded in his political affiliations as being a member of one or the other of the two major parties. In fact, he is just that! Except that no matter what his formal or announced party affiliation has been, there was always the super-added consideration and acute awareness of race. This consideration and awareness of race is a thing of necessity and not of choice. He has felt, rightly or wrongly, that his unenviable position in the social, political, and economic life of the nation required that he follow a course of action that no other members of the electorate were called upon to do; it required that he use different yardsticks of measurement, and that his standards for determining excellence and fitness be somewhat out of balance. Such was the thumbnail portrait of the independent's

5The Chicago Bee, February 9, 1936 gives an excellent account of "The Negro Sanhedrin," organized by Kelly Miller February 11, 1924. Many points similar to these are carefully discussed.
In short, the independent Negro voter has believed that he was practicing discriminate judgment when he subjected the party, its platform, and its candidates to what he considered the ultimate test: namely, will the "Negro Cause" be better served by giving his support to this party and its candidates or to some other. The test may and frequently has extended to the question of the expediency and wisdom of supporting candidates in spite of their parties—a practice that is followed with growing frequency. The charge could be raised that the test does less than full credit to the persons using it, in that it ignores and does violence to the democratic concept. As American citizens exercising the privileges of the ballot, they owe a duty to the republic and their fellow-citizens to support those instrumentalities and persons who by character and fitness have shown themselves best able to serve the whole interest. There can be no quarrel with the statement of the duty as the statement of the ideal. However, the independent Negro voter has rationalized his use of the test, and justified the compromise of the ideal as the conscious and protective reaction to the social impact of his day-to-day living in a not wholly congenial society.

The independent voter found it necessary to forego in

6The four presidential campaigns of Franklin Delano Roosevelt—1932, 1936, 1940, 1944.
large measure the prerequisites, benefits, and privileges that might have inured to one who gave unquestioning loyalty to a party. Irregularity or even no party affiliation was the penalty he had to pay when he was effectively bringing about, according to his convictions and through his use of the ballot, that minimum guarantee of constitutional and human rights to which the Negro was entitled by all standards of decency subscribed to by men who believed in the basic and essential dignity of the human soul.
CHAPTER VII

Summary and Conclusion

I Summary

The critical considerations which writers in the fields of history and political science have given to the democratic concepts recently are voluminous and interesting. These considerations represent fundamental yearning; though they are interesting, they are no different from those of the adventurers who first settled upon the American shores. We have found that the colonists brought with them a philosophy of equality, liberty, justice, the consent of the governed, majority rule, and the supremacy of the law. The lineage of many of these concepts were many centuries old when the colonists reached these lands. On the secular side, some of these concepts could be easily traced back to the state of nature, and on the sacred side, to the Garden of Eden. But in order to properly appraise the democratic ideals of the colonists, fortunately, we need to go no further back than John Locke who gave a challenging relevancy to some of these concepts in his historic defense of the revolution of 1889.

At least some, and probably many of the American colonists were students of the works of Blackstone, who wrote many of
Locke's concepts into the English common law in his Commentaries. It was the Commentaries and the Scriptures which tended to give the colonists both assurance and finality in their democratic beliefs. It is disturbing to speculate what might have happened to the ideals of the colonists if they could have foreseen a future when both the Scripture and the Commentaries were read out. Solace is found when one realizes that the earliest colonists with few exceptions were all of the same social status, that is, the middle class and consequently had much to gain and little, if anything, to lose, by insisting upon equality, liberty, justice, consent of the governed, the supremacy of the law and the doctrine of majority rule. Pioneering conditions tended to confirm them in these notions.

In recent years such men as Sir Henry Maine, Sir James Stephens, and President Nicholas Murray Butler have sought to show that in the early days there was division in the minds of the colonists in regard to the supremacy of liberty or democracy.


If the two concepts could not dwell together in peace, the colonists showed by action that equality had to go. For example, they demanded and received self-government at Jamestown in 1610, and in 1636 Cecilus Calvert granted them liberty of conscience in Maryland. Along with these men who may be designated as unfriendly to democracy conceived as equality may be listed the brilliant Frenchman, Emile Faguet. In strong and fascinating language he denies the alleged equality of men, contending that it is impossible to destroy either natural or artificial inequality.\(^6\) Happily, there are contemporary friends of democracy who are as quick to defend it as was Faguet to denounce it. For example, E. G. Conklin believes equality is the dearest of the democratic graces;\(^7\) William E. Dodd asserts, "Democracy is equality, economic, political and social in a large measure";\(^8\) W. R. Inge of St. Paul's feels assured that democracy as a form of society rests on the idea of social equality;\(^9\) James Bryce contends that the love of equality is stronger than the love of

---


Fairness to all contentions demands the declaration that all contemporary students are not as emphatic in their support of the American concepts of liberty, equality, and democracy as those cited above. However, the opposition has not been sufficient to explode the concepts. Long after this country was organized and long after the tyrannical yoke of taxation without representation had been torn asunder, slavery of large numbers of human beings—ranging from nineteen per cent of the total population in 1790 to sixteen per cent in 1860—was the common practice throughout the country. For two hundred forty-four years (1619-1863) the institution of slavery had strong supporters in every field of American life; even some ministers claimed that the Bible sanctioned it.

The concept of natural equality was refuted before 1863 and the assertion of equality in America was compelled to take another form. What form could it take? Generally speaking there were two closely connected avenues opened. First, it could change from the assertion of equality as a past or present

---


11 Monroe N. Work, Negro Yearbook, 1937-1938, 244-246.

fact to the declaration of equality as a worthy ideal. Secondly, equality in the abstract could be supplanted with equality in the concrete. Common sense observation denies equality in many things: size, endurance, intelligence, ability and capacity, etc. How may equality be made practical? The answer is under the law, in access to the democratic processes, in the enjoyment in proportion to ability of the blessings provided by this country.

In the nineteenth century the claims of human equality in America simmered down to three major claims, each more or less specific: first, all men ought to be equal before the law; second, all men ought to have equal access to the suffrage, and third, all men ought to have equality of opportunity. This does not mean to portray that from the beginning in America a struggle had not been waged for concrete equality. In earlier times equality was something other and far more than specific equalities. The fact that equality existed gave moral validity to the claim that the other democratic concepts ought to exist. The emphasis of the early colonists and statesmen was on natural rather than civil equality.

After the Civil War there was a shift in the emphasis: it was put on civil equality rather than natural equality. This change was not only from equality as a fact to equality as an
ideal, but also a change in the emphasis of equality as a natural right, to equality as a civil right. This forecasted a revolutionary change in the American attitude toward slavery. Even if there were no theoretical justification for the destruction of the institution of slavery the practicality of the doctrines of "consent of the governed" would for the most part make the institution unwise. Booker T. Washington put the situation in a nutshell when he declared, "injustice cannot work harm upon the oppressed without injuring the oppressor."13

The whole Anglo-Saxon struggle for the democratic concepts was transferred in some degree to America in the political habits of the colonists. These concepts were brought to their highest expression in the declaration of the fourteenth Amendment that no state shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Out of the desire to establish and maintain the provisions and guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment grew an insistence upon the right to vote. The story of this persistent demand and of its steady realization constitutes one of the most conspicuous chapters in the history of American democracy. Starting with a very restricted suffrage the democratic impulse has overcome suc-

cessively religious barriers, property limitations, racial dis-
qualifications and sex boundaries. Since the Republican party
championed for the Negro: emancipation, citizenship, the elec-
tive franchise, and in addition showed them deference and tol-
eration, the Negro came to believe the Republicans were the
cause of every reform they had witnessed for their betterment.

For a very short time the Republicans proved worthy of the con-
vidence imposed in them by Negroes. They helped elect Negroes
to high offices in both state and national governments; they ap-
pointed Negroes to positions of authority and honor; construc-
tive and beneficial legislation was enacted in the Negroes' in-
terest; and a strenuous effort was made to raise the Negro to a
first-rate citizen.¹⁴

The first period of helpfulness was of short duration
(1865-1877) as said above. This was followed by a period of in-
difference. During the period of indifference several Republic-
an presidents not only ignored the Negro in making appointment to
positions of authority and responsibility, but expressed a de-
termination to build up a strong "Lily White" party in the South

¹⁴Raford Logan, editor, What the Negro Wants, University of
North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1944, Chapter I. Professor
Logan gives a brilliant analysis of the position of the Negro
in the United States and makes his status in the United States
far less than a full fledged citizen. As a result of careful
computation and analysis of the prerogatives and liberties of
citizens, he finds the Negro shares about one-third of such
prerogatives and liberties, and hence is a third-rate citizen.
even if it meant to sacrifice the Negro. The number of Negroes appointed to administrative positions declined, the number elected to Congress decreased, no legislation was enacted for the protection of the freedmen, or if enacted was not enforced.

From 1890 to 1910 was a period of silence: silence about enforcing the section of the Fourteenth Amendment requiring a reduction of the number of seats a state should have when the vote was denied to its citizens; silence about the revised state's constitutions with their "grandfather clauses" and poll tax requirement. The intimidations of the Ku Klux Klan and other organizations received no effective check by the Republicans even when the Republicans knew that the program of such organizations was designed to circumvent the provisions of the Fifteenth Amendment. As a result of the indifference and silence which is interpreted by the Negro as tacit acquiescence, the South was over-represented in the lower house of Congress.

In recent years, due in part to the fact that the 9,000,000 Negroes who still live in the South have had no voice in determining "who gets what" in national politics a southern representative has had a smaller constituency than one from the North. In 1940 for example in the ten southern states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas, the votes cast
for a representative averaged 44,298 while in the New England states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine and Rhode Island the vote for a representative averaged 130,778; in the middle western states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin, North Dakota and South Dakota there was an average of 133,543 votes per representative.15

II Conclusion

Suffrage for Negroes is one of the patterns in which the North and the South of the United States are most dissimilar. The question of suffrage was one of the greatest factors of change during the last two generations and had much to do with the migrations of over one and a quarter million Negroes from the South to the North. We saw in this study as a result of a careful analysis of various data, and a careful study of the documents that many persons, who were able to speak with authority, claimed the Negroes’ position in the South was precarious and that a change in his political thinking was inevitable.

The political significance of the great migration to the North lay somewhat in the concentration of the Negro in restricted areas thereby making such areas as it were, a “Black Belt.” Politicians who carefully observe group behavior pattern knew

the Negro vote in such areas was no mean prize, if it could be captured. The indifference of the Republicans, the selfishness of the Republican leaders, both white and Negroes, when set over against the increasing awareness of the power of the ballot by the Negro and the bids of the Democratic party, caused an increasing number of prominent Negroes to repudiate the Republican party. This repudiation was manifested in New York in 1924 when Negroes sent a white Democrat from Harlem to represent them in Albany; in 1928 there was a more striking manifestation when several of the leading Negro newspapers supported Smith, a Democrat, over Hoover, a Republican; in 1932 Hoover was denounced with such force and eloquence by politicians, pulpit and press that it was generally conceded that he, Hoover, would not carry the Negro vote in the pivotal states of Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York.16

Politicians fear voters and when a person is a non-voter he is politically defenseless, and no consideration is given to his wants and needs by the people in power. The changing of the dwelling place of over a million Negroes was a cause of a corresponding change in their political thought. Whereas they were complacent in the South they became politically militant in the North; whereas politics was a white man's business in the South, politics was the business of all good citizens in the

16 Opportunity, May, 1932, 141.
North, and whereas the primary election was the election in the South, the general election is the election in the North.

The Negro's position in the North, therefore, was at least partly responsible for his changed political thought. The great Carthaginian philosopher, Heraclitus, who lived about 500 B.C., is reputed to have said that all beings were constantly undergoing change. Change seems to be in the very nature of things. As far as man is concerned, life seems to offer only one of two alternatives: first, live, and grow and change, or secondly, die. Heraclitus' observation applies to nations, organizations, movements, races, and individuals. The study of every institution developed by finite man reveals a multiplicity of change in its history. The United States is no exception; she is the result of an endless chain of changes which go back to the economic, political, and religious disturbances in the old world prior to the landing of the adventurous pioneers on these shores. Americans all are therefore changed people—changed minds, changed methods, changed practices, changed loyalties, and changed ideals at times.

In order to prevent misgivings let us hasten to indicate that change may be internal or external in form and neither form in isolation necessarily connotes whether the change is for better or for worse. Before a correct evaluation or appraisal of
a change can be made the thing being changed should and must be studied for a long period by persons capable of computing its causes and consequences. The reasons for the Negro changing his political loyalties from the Republican party after 1915 are made quite apparent in this dissertation.

It was impossible for the Negro to join the Democratic party in the South due partly to the attitude of the southerners toward him and partly to the Negro's indifference while in the South, to political affairs. The great exodus of Negroes from the South beginning in 1915 gave the Negro an opportunity to be politically important again, both parties bidding for his support. The Democrat's success in wooing him from the Republican party is due in part to the fact that in some of the larger cities where Negroes concentrated the Democrats were usually in power: New York, Boston, and Kansas City. In those cities the theory that the Democrats stood for the status quo as opposed to liberal reforms and helpfulness was put to flight and there was a tendency for more and more Negroes to align themselves with the Democrats.

When the Republicans became aware that Negro votes were no longer to be carried in the vest pocket of some particular leader simply because he was a Republican, and when they saw Negroes responding in ever increasing numbers to the bids of the Demo-
crats, their silence and indifference about him turned into articulation and efforts. Planks in their platforms were again inserted. A few Negroes began to be elected to a few state legislatures on the Republican ticket, and there are a few instances in which Negroes were appointed to commanding positions. Thus there was a rivalry between the Republicans and Democrats for the Negro's support.

Beginning in 1932, due in part to the depression, the Negroes' support went strongly for the Democratic party. Men who had been Republicans for over half a century found enough fault with the party to justify them in changing to the Democratic. The Democrats made several promises in the campaign which they kept relative to the Negro. This was one means of keeping the Negro after the Democrats had secured his support. The reform legislation enacted by the Democrats, the administration of the relief agencies with deference shown Negroes, the courageous equalitarian pronouncements of the Democratic president and the support given to Negroes on the Democratic ticket by the party hierarchy are some of the factors that enter into the changed political thought of the Negro since 1915.

By 1940 the Negro in the North had come to believe that it was an exercise in good citizenship to plant his loyalties under men and measures, not under traditional labels. His quest to
attain first-rate citizenship and, to promote his interests, caused him to migrate from the South and to change his traditional Republican allegiance and become independent as a voter. His independence as a voter raised his political stock due in part at least, to the bids of the major parties for his support and the universal deference shown him by them. The Communist party, in an effort to capture the Negro's vote went so far as to nominate a Negro, James W. Ford, for vice-president in 1932 and 1936 and carried on a vigorous campaign among Negroes for his election.

Resulting from the deference and considerations shown the Negro, he gained a new sense of his political value and importance. While in 1915 and previously he was a Republican and a Republican only, in 1940 he was largely an independent voter, supporting men and measures, not party labels alone.

The Negroes who remained with the Republicans demanded more of the party than ever before: more liberal reforms, more jobs for more people, more consideration in the party council while organizing more resistance to the undemocratic practices of the South. Negroes who supported other parties did so with the commitment from the party's boss that every consideration enjoyed by other American citizens would be placed at the Negro's disposal. Neither of the parties has been able to
carry out the promises of their leaders in full, but no one can deny that each of the major parties has been recently far more considerate of the Negro's interest than prior to 1932.

Historically, shifts of opinion have operated with an extraordinary degree of regularity. Arthur M. Schlesinger worked out a chart of the periods of change from conservatism to liberalism marking leftward swings with the sign—#:

- 1) 1765-1787
- 2) 1787-1801
- 3) 1801-1816
- 4) 1816-1829
- 5) 1829-1841
- 6) 1841-1861
- 7) 1861-1869
- 8) 1869-1901
- 9) 1901-1918
- 10) 1918-1931

He based his conclusion on an analysis of what he called the "dominant national mood as expressed in effective governmental action." One notices these periods do not lend themselves to any one political party. Parties can be clearly ruled out as the primary energies for bringing about change. Both of our major parties have known their periods of conservatism and of inaction, and have reflected the spirit of these deeper historical cycles. We have noticed protest groups not only among Negroes, but among workers and farmers, all of which have been important in bringing about changes in party alle-

giance or shifts from right to left. We found other ponderable forces at work among Negroes than former party affiliation and loyalties, but no correlation can be established between what was offered by any political party and the amount of support the party received from the Negro. Schlesinger's conclusion seems to be a correct one. "Apparently the electorate embarks on conservative policies until it is disillusioned or wearied or barred, and then attaches itself to liberal policies until a similar course is run." 18

Every election upset seems to have marked a unique period of opinion. For example, the time was favorable for a change of policy under Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom, and Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal. The intervening Harding-Coolidge-Hoover period gave an atmosphere of a different sort. Thus our history reveals clearly distinguishable periods when accomplishments which at one time could not be made and achieved were at other times under other conditions attained. The era of Jacksonian democracy had its force and flavor. The Reconstruction period reflected a different state of mind as have also the Progressive period and the New Deal. We are therefore forced to conclude with Crane Brinton that human beings can go only so far and so

18Ibid., 229.
long under the stimulus or an ideal.\textsuperscript{19} Therefore change is not only going on all the time in all finite things, but it has been welcomed phenomenon since 1915 in the realm of politics by the major parties and the Negro.

One notices that the changed political thought of the Negro has not been to any considerable extent from one extreme to another. He has tended to be moderate in both thought and action. For example when the Communist party in 1932 and again in 1936 made strenuous effort to gain the Negro's support by nominating a Negro, James W. Ford, for vice-president, the Negro showed no unusual excitement. A study of election returns in sections where large numbers of Negroes vote indicates the Communist party was not very popular with Negroes.\textsuperscript{20}

The bids of the two major parties for the Negroes' support has given a new sense of his political importance which has made him somewhat of an independent in politics. Independence does not mean they are aloof toward the two major parties, but they are no longer following labels, but men and issues. The Negroes


\textsuperscript{20}World Almanac, 721-747. One may study the returns in such cities as New York, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Baltimore, and Boston. The districts in those cities where Negroes were concentrated showed little or no vacillation beyond the Democratic-Republican contest. In no city did the Communist ticket poll enough votes to threaten either the Republican party or the Democrat.
who remained Republicans have demanded far more of the party in terms of progressive legislation, reforms, and deference than they demanded before 1915. There has not only been a change from Republicans to Democrats and, to a position of independence, but there has been a change in demands by the Negro upon the party he supports.

Thus the Negro says with Elinor Wylie in her poem entitled "Quarrel":

Let us quarrel for these reasons:
You detest the salt which seasons
My speech; and all my lights go out
In the cold poison of your doubt.
I love Shelley, you love Keats;
Something parts, and something meets.
I love salads, you love chops;
Something starts, something stops;
Something hides its face and cries
Something shines, something dies.
I love blue ribbon brought from hairs;
You love sitting, splitting hairs;
I love truth and so do you,
Tell me, is it truly true?
This dissertation is compiled largely from source material which is so abundant and interesting that a person might easily spend an entire life studying it. Secondary materials have been used to reflect contemporary opinions and trends in Negro thought. In nearly every instance where secondary materials were used the material was compiled by men of high scholarship and integrity who used original sources and documents. Therefore, the secondary material is reliable whether it represents observation, reason, or research.

Both source and secondary materials are arranged in the order of their importance or value for this study. Another study by another person who might employ considerable portions of these data, might arrange his data differently, because what is of primary importance in this study might not be of primary importance in another.

No effort is made to list all materials of value used in this study, but to list only the most valuable for this dissertation. It is possible that an error is made in listing what follows as most important for so much enters one's subconsciousness when he reads intensely and extensively as to render him at times unaware of its origin, and thus he writes it as his own. What appears therefore to be original, may be unoriginal in the
sense that at least parts of it entered the mind from ideas expressed or suggested by other persons. With this thought in mind, the writer's consciousness of materials fall into two broad classes: I. Source, II. Secondary.
I. Sources:

Congressional Record, Vols. 34, pt. 2, 56 Congress, Second Session, also Vols. 37, Second Session, 1866-67, 70-71, 91-92; Congressional Globe, 1868, Vol. VI, also the 39th Congress, 1866, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., were of unusual value in that they contain accounts of committee reports, debates, speeches, and reports of investigations and subjects involving Negroes. Similar data are found in other volumes, but these volumes contained material indicated in the dissertation in various places. By using materials contained in these documents one is able to judge both the individual and his party's policy in reference to the Negro.

The proceedings of the National Republican Convention, 1854-1940, and the Minutes of the National Democratic Convention 1876-1940. These data indicate the considerations given to the Negro problem in the National Conventions of the two major political parties. Their expressions or silences were valuable in both inference and in making deductions.

William Hickey, editor, State Papers, Public Documents and other Sources or Political and Statistical Information, T. K. and P. G. Collins, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1847, contains several documents from which materials were obtained relative to customs, laws and practices in several states and how they affected the Negro both slave and free.

Miscellaneous Documents of the House of Representatives for the Second Session of the 47th Congress, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1882-1883, contained valuable records of the Negroes in Congress; the speeches made by some of them, bills introduced, their participation in debates and discussions, the committees on which they served and much valuable personal data.

G. Hunt and J. B. Scott, ed., Debates in the Federal Conventions of the United States or America, Oxford University Press, New York, 1920, gives a most detailed account of the heated debates between people who supported slavery and those who opposed it; the three-fifth clause, the representation in Congress clause, and several other compromises.

Senate Report on a Portion of the Message of the President, March 16, 1865, contained Lincoln's recommendation of a Freedmen's Bureau for educational development of the Negro.

W. O. Blake, The Political History of Slavery in the United States, Columbus, Ohio, 1857. A compilation of source material published and sold exclusively by subscription. The greatest value of this work in the immediate undertaking lies in the wealth of material on the question of slavery which it contains. It covers every phase of slavery in the United States.

Carter G. Woodson, ed., The Mind of the Negro as Reflected in Letters written during the Crisis, 1800-1860, The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Washington, D. C., contains letters from several persons, the most valuable for this study were the letters from Frederick Douglass to Mr. Auld and to William Lloyd Garrison.


Frank Moore, The Rebellion Record, G. P. Putnam, New York, 1861, Volumes I and II, is a compilation of events relative to slavery, indicating who said what, when, and how about the Negro, his rights and duties and prerogatives, thereby revealing the mentality of the time.

William Waller Herring, Statutes At-Large, being a collection of Laws of Virginia from the First Session of its Legislature in 1619, Volume II, Richmond, 1819. The value of this document lay in what it says about slaves: manumission and how obtained, children of mixed races and their status, and the treatment or slaves, etc.

Helen J. Cotterall, Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro, two volumes, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C., 1926, was most helpful in revealing the efforts of the Negro to obtain freedom as a slave, and to enjoy his freedom since emancipation. The value of these cases cannot be over-emphasized in this study for they reveal the Negro's faith in the court was superior to his faith in the legislative or administrative branches or the government.

A. B. Hart and Edward Channing, American History Leaflets, Colonial and Constitutional, Parker B. Simmons Company, Incorporated, New York, 1896, is a collection of source material on such questions as the provisions of the Northwest Ordinance 1784.
187; the Missouri Compromise, the Dred Scott Decisions, the Louisiana Purchase, and several other such topics.

The Census Reports of the Bureau of the Census, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., were valuable in determining the growth and decline of the Negro percentage in the population, the trends in Negro migration; their achievements in education, commerce, and business and similar questions, 1790-1940.

A. B. Hart, editor, American History Told by Contemporaries, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1920, in five volumes, was the account of the thinking or representative citizens on many basic problems in our country.

Monthly Labor Review, The Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., a monthly report on the state of labor by the Census Bureau, was of value in studying labor movement 1915-1940, and especially Negro labor in the period.

The World Almanac, The New York World Publishing Company, 1940, 1945, was valuable in studying the election returns thereby indicating the popularity of candidates for office in local, state or national election.

United States Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, 1921-1930, valuable for information of where the Negro went when they left the South in this period.

Thomas Marshall in the House of Delegates of Virginia on the Policy of the State in Relation to her Colored Population, January 14, 1832, Richmond, Virginia, 1832, was revealing of Virginia's stand on the question of emancipation of slaves who had become converted.


R. R. Wright, Jr., "What does the Negro Want in our Democracy," National Conference of Social Workers, Proceedings, 1919, 139-44.


The Negro in Chicago, Chicago Commission on Race Relations, The University of Chicago Press, 1921. This is a compilation of the finding of the Chicago Crime Commission which was valuable in indicating problems raised by the increasing numbers of Negroes there.

The Chicago Tribune, Tribune Company, Chicago.
Cincinnati Post, Post Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.
The New York Evening Post, D. S. Thackery, Publisher.

II. Secondary material is divided for convenience into
four sections: first, Magazines; secondly, Books; third, News-
papers and Letters.

II. PERIODICALS AND MAGAZINES

Volume 82, 15. (Editorial) "Who But Hoover."

Opportunity, Journal of Negro Life, Quarterly, National Urban
League, 1138 Broadway, New York City. Articles are
listed by either volume or date. The title of the
article is given in order to indicate its bearing on
this subject.


February, 1932, 141, "Presidential Polls" (Editorial).

March, 1932, "How Should the Negro Vote?" (Editorial).

November, 1932, The Republican, Ogden L. Mills, and the
Democrat, James A. Farley, discuss the pro-
gram and policies of their respective parties
as they relate to the Negro--propaganda.

January, 1933, Editorial, "The Negro votes shifted from
the traditional alignment of the Republican
Party to the Democratic and Socialist Parties.

Ibid., "Did the Negro Revolt?"


Ibid., 321, "The Negro is becoming Intelligent on the Question of Party Affiliation."

August, 1938, "Mayor Hague and the Negro."


June, 1939, (Editorial), "The Forty Ninth State Movement."

Articles dealing with the election of 1940 appear in the issues of 1941 which are beyond the scope of this study.

The Crisis, The Crisis Publishing Company, Incorporated, 69 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Valuable help was received from articles indicated by date and title.


September, 1920, "How Shall We Vote?"

October, 1928, Floyd Keeler, "The Poll Tax."

November, 1928, "How Should We Vote?"

October, 1932, "Why the Negro Should Vote for Hoover."

May, 1936, "Landon and the Negro."

June, 1937, "Political Future of the Negro as a voter."

October, 1937, "A New Party."

The Nation, The Nation's Press, New York. Help received from this publication is indicated by title and volume.


"President Harding and Social Security," Volume 113, 561 ff.

Freda Kirchew, "Wendell L. Willkie's Speech," Volume 151, 144-145.

(Editorial) "The Lawless Nation," 1929, Volume 129.

(Editorial) "Hoover and the Wheat," 1931, Volume 133.

The Political Science Quarterly, edited by Faculty of Political Science, Columbia College, New York, Volume II, 680-86.


Volume 17, October 1922, Henry A. Wallace, "Negro Delegates from South Carolina to meet Republican Convention."

Volume 2, (Editorial), "Negro's Political Power in the South."


A. L. Harris, "Negro Migration to the North," 1924, Volume 20, 924-925.

Oren Roote, "This is Wendell Willkie," Volume 52, p. 7, 63.

Robert M. Lovett, "Chicago, the Phenomenal City," Volume 31, 328-347.


Literary Digest, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York.

(Editorial) "The Negro Status Declared by the President," November 19, 1921, Volume 71.


J. Q. C. Lamar, "Ought the Negro to be Disfranchised?" Volume 138.


Ibid., 223, "Hoover as a Great White Father."

Ibid., 223, "Hoover and the Negro."


III. Books

This list is not exhaustive, but represents the books which were found most helpful. The specific and frequent references
to some of them indicate their value.


*The Soul of Black Folk*, A. C. McClurg Company, Chicago, 1940.


W. O. Blake, The Political History of Slavery in the United States, Columbus, Ohio, 1857.


Virginia Dabney, Below the Potomac, D. Appleton Century Company, New York, 1924.


Frederick Douglass, The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass, Pathway Press, New York City, 1941, (Centenary Memorial Subscribers' Edition.)


Richard Hildreth, Despotism in America, An Inquiry into the Slave-holding System, John J. Jewett and Company, Cleveland, Ohio, 1854.


Edgar T. Thompson, Patterns of Race Conflicts, Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina.


Henry Wilson, Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1879.


Arna Bontemps and Jack Conroy, They Seek a City, Doubleday, Doran and Company, New York, 1945.


APPENDIX I

Questionnaire:

1. Age  ___________  Over 21  ___________  Under 21  ___________
2. Sex: Male  ___________  Female
3. Residence  ___________  State  ___________  County  ___________  Town
4. Were you born in this state?  Yes  ___________  No
5. Were you born in the North?  ___________  South?
6. If you were born in the South, do you plan to return?
7. If you were born in the South, how old were you when you left?  Over 21  ___________  Under 21
8. Did you leave of your own volition?  Yes  ___________  No
9. What was the main reason for your leaving?

10. Education: (check highest level reached) Grade School
    High School  ___________  Trade School
    College  ___________  Professional School
11. Political Party:  Democrat  ___________  Republican
    Independent
12. Have you ever paid poll taxes?  Yes  ___________  No
    Voted in Primary?  Yes  ___________  No  In state election?
    Yes  ___________  No  In national elections?
    Yes  ___________  No  How many times in either?
13. What party did you support prior to 1932?  Democrats  ___________  Republicans
14. Were you ever prevented from voting?  Yes  ___________  No
15. Have you ever contested your right to vote?  Yes  ___________  No
16. Results:

17. The answers to questions 7, 8, 9, and 12 are exceedingly important in furnishing information needed in a dissertation. Give these questions your immediate attention. In number 16, you may make any additional statement you like.
APPENDIX II

6505 Langley Avenue
Chicago, Illinois
August 21, 1945

Mr. Elbert L. Tatum
5915 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

My dear Sir:

I am more than ordinarily happy to execute the questionnaire which you sent to me. I am taking time to make additional comments because, first, the problem you are dealing with is one which has been close to my heart for years, and secondly, having been in a politically conscious setting all my life, my father having been a member of the state legislature of Mississippi in my early days; my brother, Perry, being active in politics since we were in our early twenties, and I, myself, having led Negro delegations to the national conventions a time or two, makes me somewhat of an authority on certain phases of the Negro's political life. Negroes have been betrayed by the Republicans since 1877 when the federal troops were withdrawn from the South. Since then, the Republicans have got the Negro's vote, but have forgot them in most beneficial matters.

Now as to the questions 7, 8, 9, why I left the South. I left the South not in an effort to make more money than I was making in Meridian, Mississippi, but I left in order that my children might have an opportunity to develop their talents and capacities unhampered and unrestrained by a prejudiced and personality-dwarfing environment. Observation and experience had taught me that the average southern Negro was possessed with an inferiority complex that he would not have had, had he been in a northern environment. For a Negro child to be reared in the South in his early and formative years is to take the chance of stifling his mentality and curbing his ambitions. The way to avoid those possibilities was for me to take them away to a place where the doors of opportunity were open to them or at least not tightly shut simply because they are Negroes.

Moving from the South permitted me to pool my resources, mental, spiritual, and material, with other oppressed and suppressed people in the interest of a fuller and nobler life. Thus a man was neither loved nor hated, admired nor admonished, be-
cause of the political label he wore. My position was no different from thousands of others.

Many additional facts will be given to you when you come over to the office.

Very truly yours,

Dr. Elmer E. Howard
APPENDIX III

Mr. Elbert Lee Tatum
5915 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago 37, Illinois

October 10, 1945

Dear Mr. Tatum:

In addition to executing your carefully prepared questionnaire I am giving my reasons for remaining a Republican:

Sentiment does not sway me in my political affiliations. Nevertheless I am not oblivious to the political history of my country. History reveals to me that the overwhelming part of the colored American's political, economic and social advancement has been made under Republican leadership.

Emotional approaches based upon the service of "Lincoln, the Great Emancipator" and the "Colored Man's Debt to The Republican Party" have negligible influence in shaping my political opinions.

I am a Republican because I am convinced that most of the truly, liberal and sympathetically interested politicians, of the white race, are members of that party. They are not primarily interested in political preferment but have a well-conceived attitude and policy favorable to colored people. Political expediency in Republican attitudes is not nearly so apparent as with the Democrats. I am led into this state of mind because even among northern Democratic circles many prominent Democratic leaders have declared that "This is a white man's country" and that "the colored man must know his place."

It is impossible for me to reconcile myself to the National Democratic party while the solid south is still in the saddle and corrupts and contaminates the philosophy of the body politic. Flagrant evidence of racial attitudes of the respective parties is always evident at the National Conventions. The colored voter is extended almost every courtesy by the Republicans but the Democrats, even there, are unable to conceal their contempt and opprobrium. The reactionary, unreconstructed Bourbon southerners sally above the Mason-Dixon and without fear of rebuke give vent to their intolerance and bigotry.
While in State and local elections, I can see the virtue of the colored citizen oftentimes splitting his vote, I have never yet witnessed the occasion when I deemed the time propitious for me or any other colored American to vote the National Democratic ticket.

While I am fully aware that the Republican party is sadly in need of dynamic, liberal leadership, and while I am conscious of the failure of the party to comprehend and understand that the nation has reached the end of an economic and political era, I fully believe that the Republican Party will adapt itself to political and changing social conditions with more intelligence than Democrats.

If your space and my time permitted, much more would be said about the matter. Let this suffice until the extension.

Yours very truly,

Joseph D. Bibb
Mr. Elbert L. Tatum
5915 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago 37, Illinois

Dear Sir:

It was a genuine pleasure to fill out the questionnaire. These other comments will probably be of help to you in your undertaking.

Many political parties have come upon the scene since the establishment of our Country, but it was not until the Republican Party organized and took the reigns of government that we made any progress towards the Nation we are now.

It has been established in our country that we live and exist under a two party system and no more, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party; therefore in choosing your political destiny, one must make up his mind which one of two parties, Democratic or Republican, best represents his ideals and aims.

Some people think that the choice of a political party is by accident, far be it from that; The farmer, the industrialist and the businessman from Europe, of the Scandinavian Countries, as a rule are Republicans, while the Irish and the people who come from the Central and Eastern parts of Europe, such as Poland, and Bohemia, are Democrats. Thus you see a higher class of foreigners affiliating with the Republicans than with the Democrats.

The chief reason for that is the former were landowners, business men and industrialists who thought they could better protect themselves in the Republican party here. On the other hand, the people who migrated from the Central and Eastern Europe were usually poor and thought they could better reach their objective in the Democratic Party.

The Republican Party offers the only hope for the Negro, that is my reason for remaining loyal to it. The Republican Party believes in high tariff, which keeps a lot of goods by cheap labor from coming into our Country, competing with American goods. Without such protection, cheap labor would lower our
standard of living. The Republican Party believes in a strict enforcement of Civil Service laws, thereby giving the Negro his best chance to obtain Civil Service positions.

In studying the two parties one must take into consideration the development of the country under the party, its method of procedure and activity. The procedure of our two party system makes it impossible for the Negro to achieve any great degree of success under the Democratic Party; for instance, since March 4, 1933, the Democratic Party has been in control of our National Government, but not one single piece of legislation has been enacted for them. Through the seniority rule in Congress, the Chairman of every important Committee in Congress is a Southerner, who is a Democrat and he makes it impossible to get constructive legislation in the Negro's interest. In fact, it is rare to get it out of the Committees.

The party is always larger than the man; men come and go in both parties, but the principles, issues, and ideals go on. The Republican party's past history on immigration, tariff, Civil Service and labor as well as its efforts at present, all react to the benefit of the Negro, who must to a greater degree than anyone else in this Country, depend upon earning his living and maintaining himself through labor. It is for these reasons I am a Republican.

Signed

Ernest A. Greene
Mr. Elbert L. Tatum  
5915 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, 37, Illinois  

Dear Sir:

Here is the questionnaire you sent me. I am in addition to your questions attempting to defend my position.

It was about 1915 that the bonds which held the Negro to the Republican party began to dissolve. The bitterness which had existed after the Civil War between white North and white South was disappearing. Closer social and economic ties were bringing them together and the South waged an unrelenting battle to win the North over to its racial credo.

The administration of William Howard Taft when he openly declared that he was forsaking the policy of appointing Negroes to office in southern states against the wishes of the majority of residents there was an open indication that the Republican Party no longer intended to try to build up its party strength in the South through reliance upon Negroes. Various efforts to develop a white, so called "lily-white" Republican party in the South followed. Gradually Negro Republican leaders in the South were superceded as delegates and finally only one Negro national committeeman served as a symbol representing the Negroes in the party and his was admittedly a rotten borough type of representation. Negroes practically disappeared from important federal office-holding.

Gradually big business which used politics after all to maintain its status quo, saw that it could make tools of southern senators and congressmen as easily as it could northern. A combination began to develop which is flowering today and finds the democratic southern representatives espousing bills which are representative of the conservative business interests of the North.

In the meantime, the older Negro leadership which thought in terms of the Republican party and Abraham Lincoln as their saviors from slavery, were dying off. At the same time the descendants of the Union soldiers who fought in the Civil War
and the abolitionists of New England were passing. The new generation of Negroes, short lived as to memories, by the time Roosevelt and the New Deal appeared upon the scene developed a totally different brand of political thinking. They made cause with labor and the masses as against the classes whom they previously had served.

The New Deal through appointment of well trained young Negroes to important positions, greater in number if not in degree of importance, captured the thinking of the Negro masses until district after district formerly solidly Republican, now is as definitely Democratic.

Very truly yours,

Claude A. Barnett
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